

recent testimony before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the House Appropriations Committee announced a new policy of the Defense Department to release military personnel from billets which can be filled by civilian employees. Mr. Paul clearly states that one of the results of this new policy can be to "increase combat strengths," a need which our President has recently stated.

As reported in the Journal of the Armed Forces on July 24, 1965, Secretary Paul stated further:

Clearly, military personnel should be utilized in combat units or in units whose mission and contingency plans call for the deployment of personnel on short notice to a combat environment.

Thus, the proper use of military manpower is a subject of serious concern to men of stature and knowledge. It is not an idle issue which is idly raised.

The letter from Mr. Wolkomir and the news release follow:

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The use of military personnel in traditionally civilian positions in the Federal service is costly, wasteful, and unsound from every standpoint.

It is a practice, however, which not only is widespread but is accelerating at an alarming rapid rate.

Because of the importance of this problem nationally, I am taking the liberty of calling to your attention a statement just released to the press and other news media on behalf of the NFFE.

I would appreciate any comment you may care to make on this vital issue.

Yours sincerely,

N. T. WOLKOMIR,
President.

President Nathan T. Wolkomir, of the National Federal of Federal Employees, today assailed the Department of Defense for "flagrant failure to take effective action to curb the wide and still growing use of military personnel in civilian positions."

At the same time he said that he was presenting to Representative DAVID N. HENDERSON, of North Carolina, chairman of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, "additional hard-fact case evidence of this entire situation, which is worsening from week to week."

The NFFE executive cited figures from the Secretary of Defense's own directorate of statistical services which, he asserted, "provide irrefutable proof of the seriousness of this problem." He said that in the period 1960-64, there was a 110,000 increase in uniformed personnel in the Army with a corresponding decline of 20,500 civilian jobs. In the Air Force uniformed personnel jumped by 42,046 while civilian employees dropped by 18,000. In the Navy there was a 50,000 increase in uniformed people while 14,300 civilians were dropped.

"These figures prove beyond all doubt that military are replacing civilians in traditionally civilian jobs in all three services at an accelerated pace and all indications we have are that this trend is continuing," President Wolkomir said.

He declared that "we continue to receive from DOD pious platitudes and vague assurances which give little indication of a genuine desire to take effective remedial action. Moreover, we find that regardless of DOD policy enunciated at the Pentagon, the use of military personnel in civilian positions not only persists but is mounting at many installations and bases all across the Nation.

"We find it incredible that the Pentagon does not know that this is the case. We find it shocking that, knowing what is taking place, there is continued flagrant failure to act forthrightly to curb this wasteful, costly, inefficient practice."

The NFFE executive said that while some of the blame for this practice must be laid at the door of Congress, since insufficient appropriations for civilian support services account in part for it, "the Department of Defense cannot evade the major responsibility."

"The fact is," he said, "that this problem has been with us for many years and has been mounting in extent and seriousness. Much of it, experience shows conclusively, stems from the desire of some base commanders to have uniformed personnel in virtually all positions, even those clearly, obviously and historically civilian in nature. At many installations, therefore, we find outright and persistent violation of DOD policies and regulations dealing with manpower utilization. Is DOD, below Chief of Staff level, not aware of the fact that military control of manpower, both military and civilian, places them in the position of adjudicating their own violations of DOD policy?"

"This is a situation which has been of great and growing concern to Congress. Representative HENDERSON and his subcommittee have given much attention to it and are to be highly commended for that concern."

"But the time has now come for action. DOD has tolerated violation of its policies far too long. DOD, for whatever reason, has failed to get the message to its base commanders and others charged with carrying out policy at the local level."

"The dangers in the complete militarization of the Defense Establishment long have been recognized by successive Chief Executives, including Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. The danger is real and it is present, and its further growth is a national hazard of the first magnitude. Further, its growth represents a callous negation of the military-civilian team concept in our defense posture which is so completely vital to our national security. Loss of essential civilian skills in the military establishment is proceeding at an alarming pace. DOD's complicity in the face of this loss is incomprehensible."

"DOD's response to the presentation of facts on this issue is evasion and equivocation. Therefore, it is essential for Congress to make known its concern more emphatically, more directly, and more forcefully than ever before."

"It grows increasingly clear that drastic action will be required to bring a reversal in DOD action on this issue, which is so vital to every American citizen."

WAR ON POVERTY

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I see the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965 as the most effective war on poverty legislation yet passed this session.

When you consider that three-fourths of the people accepted under the old act were unemployed at the time, you must realize that this new expanded program will provide means to lessen the numbers of jobless even more. It is mostly a lack of income that creates poverty and with the trades taught under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, these jobless people are given the skills necessary to become wage earners.

It is reported that there are about 3½ million disabled Americans today who need the services of this program. There are 300,000 added to this total every year. If we are to meet the demands of training the disabled of this country, we must rehabilitate and place in employment more than the 135,000 yearly figure we reached last year. This newly passed legislation will provide for reaching the annual goal of 200,000 rehabilitated in the next 3 years or less.

I also congratulate the authors of the amendments for recognizing one of the great needs of our present-day society; that of rehabilitating the mentally retarded youths and adults. In 1964, the vocational rehabilitation program reached more than 7,200 mentally retarded Americans and the expanded program intends to reach even more.

The bill also provides for assistance in the construction of new workshops and rehabilitation facilities and in the operation of new facilities. These facilities are the tools with which the trained men and women shape the lives of these unfortunate individuals who seek their help.

I know that we in Minnesota take a great pride in our efforts in behalf of the handicapped individual and welcome these new strides in the direction that we, as a State, have struggled in.

BREAD PRICES ARE UP

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, Members of this body received a letter from Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman in which he declared:

Consumer prices for wheat products have remained stable. Bread prices in the past 12 months have averaged around 21 cents a loaf or less, virtually unchanged from the period before the certificate program went into effect.

He quoted derisively predictions made a year ago that the certificate program would lead to higher consumer prices.

By using loose phrases like "averaged around" and "virtually unchanged" the Secretary protected himself while attempting to mislead you.

The truth is bread prices are up.

The Department of Agriculture Crop Reporting Board issued a report July 30 showing on page 23 that average price paid by farmers for white bread per pound—the average loaf weighs 1 pound—on June 15, 1965 was 21.2 cents compared with 20.6 cents on June 15, 1964. This increase of 0.6 cent amounted to 3 percent, an increase that is especially significant when one considers that low-income families rely most heavily on bread.

Let us not forget to that the farm bill (H.R. 9811) proposes to raise the value of the domestic wheat certificate by at least another 50 cents a bushel. Secretary Freeman admits this means 0.7 cent rise in the cost of a pound loaf of bread.

Secretary Freeman issued a speech text today in which he predicted net

August 2, 1965

18270

farm income will be reduced by as much as 50 percent if Congress fails to act. This horror story is pure speculative fiction and grossly misleading. If no farm legislation is passed this year, wheat farmers will be covered by the very same program Secretary Freeman twisted congressional arms to enact in 1962. Feed grains and cotton farmers will be covered by programs amended in 1958 and 1963 which, with proper administration, will cut Government costs, reduce surpluses, strengthen income opportunities for the farmer in the marketplace, and make him less dependent on Government payments.

As the day for reckoning on the farm bill (H.R. 9811) approaches, we should bear in mind that Secretary Freeman's office often becomes a propaganda mill and his statements are not always reliable.

HUMANE CARE OF ANIMALS USED IN RESEARCH

(Mr. SPRINGER (at the request of Mrs. REM of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the humane care of animals used in scientific research.

Experimental use of animals in laboratories undoubtedly has contributed to the achievements of medical research for the benefit of all mankind.

The Congress, as well as many of our State legislatures, have pondered for many years the question of how best to relieve the suffering of laboratory animals and at the same time to safeguard the legitimate interest of science.

As ranking minority member of both the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and its Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare, I have long sought a solution for this problem.

The bill which I am cosponsoring with my committee colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] will not prevent medical researchers from using animals, but it will require laboratories to maintain high standards of care to spare these animals avoidable pain and discomfort. Laboratories failing to conform to such standards would be ineligible for Federal research funds.

Several years ago, our committee obtained enactment of humane slaughtering legislation to curb abuses and unnecessary cruelty in meatpacking plants. Surely, we can assure minimum standards of humane care for laboratory animals.

I am glad to say that this bill has the support of both the American Humane Association and the Humane Society of the United States. This is the first time that the two largest humane organizations have endorsed a single legislative approach to this problem.

Section 1 of my bill declares it to be the policy of the United States that animals used in laboratories shall be procured and cared for in a humane manner and the number used shall be reduced as far as possible, in order to fulfill

the ethical and moral obligations of a civilized society as well as to increase the degree of reliability of scientific information obtained through their use.

To put this policy into effect, the bill provides for an independent Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare to be established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would be headed by a coordinator appointed by the President who would be charged with the responsibility for the promotion of the best care, handling and use of laboratory animals by every practicable means. For example, he could send consultants to any laboratory requesting such assistance, furnish advice on the design, construction and maintenance of facilities for laboratory animals, and establish training programs aimed at improving the skills of animal handlers in the laboratories.

A great deal of work has gone into the drafting of this legislation to assure humane treatment for laboratory animals without impeding their legitimate use for medical research. I am requesting the chairman of our committee to schedule early hearings on this bill and wholeheartedly urge its enactment.

THE CHALLENGE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the President has recommended to the Congress and the people that the United States greatly expand its military assistance to South Vietnam. Slightly more than a month ago there were 72,000 American troops in South Vietnam. Soon there may be more than 100,000 Americans in that country. As a result, we face an increase in the draft; and our soldiers face longer tours of duty in Vietnam.

These are painful decisions, but there is—in my mind, at least—no doubt about the answer. For the challenge in Vietnam is a challenge to the free world. We have always maintained that the people of Vietnam must be free to determine their own government and their own course in world affairs. That has always been our sole demand. In making that demand, we have affirmed the fundamental American idea that it is the people of a country, and they alone, who have the right to decide what kind of country they want to live in. In 1776 our forebearers believed that truth to be self-evident and we believe it now.

No man, and no nation, need ask toward whom the challenge of tyranny is really directed in Vietnam. The freedom of the Vietnamese people has become inseparable from the freedom of all people, including our own.

We are engaged in the test of a proposition—whether this planet can be governed in freedom and in peace, or whether free men must inevitably succumb to violence. We are no longer protected by geography. Our safety now depends on the strength of our purpose, and our willingness to sacrifice.

Make no mistake—if we decline or evade the challenge now in Vietnam, we will soon be facing it somewhere else.

Our friends and enemies alike will make their judgment and plan their future on the basis of the choice we now make. The present challenge is merely one in a long line of challenges, past and future.

The question is not "can we afford to stand our ground in Vietnam," but rather "can we afford not to." The answer is clear to our President, it is clear to our military leaders, it is clear to me—and I believe that it is clear to the overwhelming majority of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. ROSENTHAL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. DIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WATER—A NATURAL RESOURCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. TUNNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is time, I believe, to make a few overdue observations about water—A natural resource which is necessary to all forms of life and upon which our national prosperity is dependent.

It is not sufficient just to talk about the inadequate supply of water for our major population centers throughout the Nation. It is not enough to frighten our citizens in the arid southwest and the congested east with prognoses of water rationing. Much more is required than speeches and alarms and then more alarms and speeches.

What is needed is planning for future water needs; and after planning, the construction of adequate facilities to guarantee an available supply of water for all agricultural, industrial, and domestic uses.

There is no single answer to the problem of water scarcity. A solution must be found by employing numerous techniques of engineering and a developing science. It is not enough to build reservoirs and transport water hundreds of miles from source to consumer. A broad attack against the mysteries of low-cost salt water conversion must be sustained and new methods to antisepticize polluted waters must be found.

The dilemma of sufficient water for future America is not for the States alone to resolve. It is an issue of national significance and must be the subject of national legislation. Rivers cut across State lines, rain which falls in one State is collected for man's use in another,

August 2, 1965

grant-in-aid device in our Federal system is the fact that organizations of State, county, and municipal governments—the grant recipients, so to speak—strongly support this provision for the systematic congressional review of new grant programs.

Another title authorizes Federal departments and agencies to render technical assistance and training services to State and local governments on a reimbursable basis, where such services are not conveniently available through ordinary channels. This will enable State and local governments to avoid the expense of unnecessary duplication of specialized or technical services, and at the same time permit more economical use of Federal facilities. Congress has already authorized such arrangements in the case of the Bureau of the Census, the Internal Revenue Service, and certain other agencies.

The next title establishes a coordinated intergovernmental urban assistance policy. It also requires local government review of certain applications for Federal programs and encourages a broader approach for review, at the metropolitan area level, of applications for loans as well as grant projects affecting urban development. Urban renewal and public housing are not included among the activities subject to review, however, since at the present stage of urban development they are usually of primary concern to only one unit of government, namely, the central city. The title basically serves to strengthen metropolitan planning machinery and encourages more orderly metropolitan growth. It also favors the eligibility of units of general local government—cities, towns, and counties—in contrast to special-purpose districts and authorities.

Another title amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act by prescribing a uniform policy and procedure for urban land transactions and use undertaken by the General Services Administration. By requiring acquisition, use, and disposal of land in urban areas by this agency to be consistent, to the extent possible, with local zoning regulations and development objectives, this title will also help make urban planning more effective.

The final title establishes a uniform Federal policy of relocation payments and assistance for all persons, businesses, and farm operations displaced by direct Federal programs and by programs conducted through Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments. It requires all such grant-in-aid programs to assure that standard housing is provided or being provided for those displaced, and provides for full Federal reimbursement of the first \$25,000 of any relocation payment and Federal sharing of any cost beyond that amount on the basis of the regular cost-sharing formula of the grant program.

As I stated at the outset, President Johnson has stressed the need for creating a new dynamic federalism and the vital role of State and local governments in achieving our goals. He has said: "What much of the world has still to learn—and we must not forget—is that levels of government must function interdependently

if they are to succeed independently. Ours is a system of interdependence. Authority is divided not to prevent action but to assure action.

This bill is a major step on the road to improving our interdependent system. The major organizations of governmental officials in this country—the Governors' conference, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, and the U.S. conference of mayors, support the principles embodied in this legislation. They are deeply interested in action by the Congress to improve intergovernmental relations. Various Federal agencies and departments have also expressed interest and support for different provisions of the bill. I look forward to prompt and thorough hearings on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the text of the bill in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. PRICE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. PRICE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. PRICE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. OTTINGER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ERRORS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. BROWN of California (at the request of Mr. PRICE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, following the President's speech on Vietnam, I was asked by the press for my comments—as were many other Members of Congress, I am sure. I responded with a statement which said, in essence, the following:

Despite my opposition to the escalation of the war in Vietnam, I must commend the President on his speech. He was moderate and restrained in the actions which he proposed to take, and he gave us increased hope for peace by the further definition of the goals we seek in Vietnam, and by his increasingly emphatic assertion of our desire and willingness to accept the help of the United Nations, or any of its members, in bringing about negotiations for the settlement of this unnecessary and undeclared war. I am confident that the President will do all in his power to prevent the tragedy of world war III.

I offer my full and wholehearted support to the President in his efforts to seek a lasting peace—a peace that is based upon the principle that the Vietnamese people shall, in the President's words, "shape their own destiny in free elections in the south or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision, and they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror."

I offered this support for efforts to secure a negotiated peace on May 5, when I felt compelled to oppose the President's request for \$700 million in additional funds for Vietnam. I said then:

Let us begin by pledging ourselves unequivocally to support the basic propositions of democracy in a Vietnam at last free from war. Let us spell it out in simple terms.

First. The people of South Vietnam shall control their own government.

Second. Every qualified citizen shall be allowed to participate freely in elections and in government office.

Third. The government shall not permit any individual or collective reprisals against persons who have collaborated in any way with one of the parties during the war or against members of such persons' families.

Fourth. A basic constitutional form of government shall be adopted within a reasonable time, subject to approval of the people.

Fifth. Elections shall be held in accordance with the constitution at the earliest possible date.

I asked further that we spell out our support for secure guarantees of any negotiated settlement, in the form of an international peace-keeping force, and our willingness to withdraw our troops and relinquish our bases when order and freedom have been restored.

I am well aware, however, that the President must contend with forces which, in the name of "national honor," oppose a negotiated peace and call for an ever-increasing escalation of this war. These are the ones who call for "victory at any price," even though their "victory" would destroy what we sought to save, weaken the fabric of freedom and democracy we seek to strengthen and sacrifice the lives of a generation of American youth.

Because of this and in answer to those voices of destruction, I must point out that despite the moderation of the President's course we have this week reached a new stage in the war we are fighting in southeast Asia—a new rung on the ladder of escalation. This is a rung which brings us measurably closer to the end of the ladder—that last rung of "spasm and insensate war," in the words of Herman Kahn.

Relatively speaking, the new step is, of course, a small one. We will only add 50,000 troops to the 75,000 now in Vietnam, and we will double monthly draft callups from 17,000 to 35,000. A few billion dollars will be added to this year's military appropriation request. The actions which are being taken and proposed to be taken are a part of our policy of "carefully measured response," whereby we escalate in a planned and deliberate way, carefully noting the results—or lack thereof—as we proceed down the road in the direction of worldwide nuclear war.

The major difficulty with this policy stems from the basically unmeasurable

August 2, 1965

and irrational nature of war. How can we tell whether the National Liberation Front and Ho Chi Minh will respond affirmatively to the sweet reason of our bombs, or whether they may decide that the destruction of their meager physical resources and the sacrifice of a few hundred thousand more of their long-suffering people is better than surrender or settlement on U.S. terms? The answer is that we cannot know. And the further we proceed with our campaign of death and destruction, the smaller becomes the significance to our opponents of a halt in our military measures and the greater becomes the chance of war with China and Russia.

History is replete with examples of peoples and armies that fought to the death for far less noble motives than the ones which inspire the Vietnamese in their resistance to U.S. military might. Despite our calculated downgrading of the enemy's purpose and aim, there can be no question but that the great majority of the Vietnamese we are fighting see themselves as the instrument of a transcendent purpose—the purpose of national freedom and liberation. As the U.S. military presence and role looms increasingly large, it but confirms to the peasants of Vietnam, and indeed to all of Asia, that this is a continuation of the Asiatic's war of liberation from the domination of the white colonialist. Whether we like it or not, there is no other adequate explanation of the growing support for the National Liberation Front among the peasants and the increasing difficulty of the Saigon government in maintaining the semblance of a government and a military force.

So, by the very act of escalation, we are strengthening the arguments of the Front. We are strengthening their image as fighters for freedom. We are weakening the motivation of the people we claim to be assisting. We are increasingly and inevitably confirming to the world a picture of this war as a race war—a war of the strong against the weak, without moral or ethical justification, and where the only result will be the genocide of the Vietnamese people.

This is the tragic result of a policy of continued escalation under the conditions which exist in Vietnam. We have armed our enemies in the Communist world with the strongest weapon in the arsenal of man—the weapon of martyrdom in the cause of freedom.

If this is so, then where does this sterile policy lead? Already we hear the cry to bomb Hanoi, to bomb the dikes which contain the Red River, and to bomb the Chinese nuclear installations. Just as we said, 6 months ago, that we had no intention of bombing North Vietnam and that this war had to be won on the ground of South Vietnam, now we say that we have no intention of bombing Hanoi or Communist China. The very policy of escalation, however, demands that we be prepared to do this. It demands that there be no permanent host-ages, no privileged sanctuaries, and no credibility gap as to our intention to go all the way—including the way of nuclear destruction. This is exactly what the "war hawks" are pressuring the President for.

World war III may well be the first war in history which no country wanted but which was precipitated by the carefully measured steps of one of the participants, drawn irresistibly to a dance of destruction by the fatal and insane logic of course of unlimited escalation—as lemmings are driven to the sea.

Because I feel so strongly on this matter I am compelled to point out that if this country had acted vigorously 11 years ago to guarantee the purposes of the Geneva agreement, we would not face the problem we face today. To say this does not solve today's problems, but to understand it may help to avoid the repetition of yesterday's errors.

The Geneva agreement provided for free elections under international supervision—the same election process that we now seek. Our Government gave encouragement—by its silence if not in more direct ways—when the Government of South Vietnam, in March 1956 and on numerous other occasions, gave notice that it would not be bound by the Geneva agreement and would not permit elections. The leading spokesmen for our Government at that time, in addition to the President and Secretary of State Dulles, were Senate Majority Leader Knowland, Senator McCarthy, Congressman Walter Judd, Vice President Nixon, and other exponents of "brinkmanship" and supporters of Chiang Kai-shek.

Since that time, the International Control Commission established to police the agreement has been a travesty. In report after report, the Commission begs for the great powers to take action leading to the political settlement of the problems in Vietnam. These pleas have gone unheeded. Let me quote from some of the Commission reports—the fifth interim report, dated January 8, 1956:

The review of the 4 months' activities presented in this report, in the view of the majority of the Commission, shows a further deterioration of the situation in Vietnam, causes serious concern about the implementation of the Geneva Agreement particularly in view of the continued nonacceptance of the Geneva Agreement and the final declaration of the Geneva Conference by the Republic of Vietnam, and also confirms the fear expressed by the majority of the Commission in the fourth interim report that the Commission cannot work with any effectiveness unless the difficulties mentioned in these paragraphs are resolved by the Cochairmen and the Geneva powers without further delay (par. 53).

And from the sixth interim report, dated September 9, 1955:

Apart from these difficulties, developments of a serious nature have taken place in South Vietnam. The Commission had already pointed out in previous reports that the transfer of power from the French authorities in the south to the authorities of the Republic of Vietnam had created difficulties in the implementation of the agreement in South Vietnam, particularly in view of the fact that the Government of the Republic of Vietnam did not consider itself as bound by the Geneva Agreement, stating that it was not a signatory to that Agreement. On April 5, 1956, the Commission received a letter from the High Commissioner for France in Saigon dated April 3, 1956, giving notice that the French high command would withdraw completely from South Vietnam on April 28, 1956 (par. 86).

The Cochairmen of the Geneva Conference discussed the matter during their talks in London and on May 8, 1956, issued messages to the International Commission, to the Government of the French Republic and a joint message to the Governments of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Republic of Vietnam. They strongly urged both the Governments in Vietnam to make every effort to implement the Geneva Agreements, to prevent any future violations of the military provisions of the agreement and to insure the implementation of the political provisions and the principles of the final declaration of the Geneva Conference. They further asked the parties to give the International Commission all possible assistance and cooperation in future in the exercise of its functions. So far as the political settlement is concerned, the Cochairmen requested the two governments to transmit their views about the time required for the opening of consultations on the organization of elections and the time required for holding of elections to unify Vietnam (par. 88).

In spite of the difficulties which it is experiencing, the Commission will, as directed by the Cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, persevere in its efforts to maintain and strengthen peace in Vietnam on the basis of the fulfillment of the Geneva Agreements on Vietnam with a view to the reunification of the country through the holding of free nationwide elections in Vietnam under the supervision of an International Commission (par. 90).

And from the seventh interim report, dated July 12, 1957:

A major difficulty facing the Commission arises from the failure to hold consultations between the two parties and free nationwide elections with a view to reunification of Vietnam. The cochairmen in their message of May 8, 1956, to the parties had asked them to indicate the time required for the opening of these consultations and, in their message of the same date to the Commission, had informed it that they attached great importance to the maintenance of the cease-fire under the continued supervision of the International Commission for Vietnam. There has been no progress in the matter of the consultations and the elections to the knowledge of the Commission. The Commission is naturally anxious about the duration of its stay in Vietnam which is conditioned by the political settlement in this country, as envisaged in the final declaration of the Geneva Conference (par. 66).

And from the eighth interim report, dated June 5, 1958:

The Commission notes that there has been no consultation between the two parties with a view to holding free nationwide elections for the reunification of the country, and to resolving the political problems and thus facilitating an early termination of the activities of the Commission and the fulfillment of its tasks. The Commission is confident that this important problem is engaging the attention of the cochairmen and the members of the Geneva Conference (par. 43).

And from the ninth interim report, dated March 10, 1959:

There has been no progress in the field of political settlement as envisaged in the final declaration of the Geneva Conference. There has been no consultation between the two parties with a view to holding free nationwide elections for the reunification of Vietnam. This has maintained the prospect of an indefinite continuance of the Commission and its activities. The Commission hopes that this important problem is engaging the attention of the cochairmen and the Geneva powers and that they will take effective measures to resolve this problem as

August 2, 1965

18285

envisaged in the final declaration of the Geneva Conference (par. 45).

And from the 10th interim report, dated April 6, 1960:

During the period under report, there has been no progress in regard to the political settlement envisaged in the final declaration. The parties have not held consultations with a view to holding free nationwide elections leading to the reunification of Vietnam and thereby facilitating early fulfillment of the tasks assigned to this Commission and the termination of its activities. The Commission is confident that this important problem is engaging the attention of the cochairmen and the Geneva powers and that they will take whatever measures they deem necessary to resolve it (par. 68).

And from the 11th interim report, dated September 18, 1961:

Once again, during the period under report there has been no progress in regard to the political settlement envisaged in the final declaration of the Geneva Conference (par. 88).

By this time the insurgency situation in South Vietnam had become serious. One wonders if the warnings issued above, and so completely disregarded by everyone concerned, should not have signalled this eventual outcome.

Because of the seriousness of the situation the Commission issued a special report, dated June 2, 1962. The State Department, in one of its rare references to the reports of the International Control Commission, made the following statement:

In June 1962 a special report on Vietnam was issued by the International Control Commission, a unit created by the Geneva conference and composed of a Canadian, an Indian, and a Pole. Though it received little publicity at the time, this report presented evidence of Hanoi's subversive activities in South Vietnam and specifically found Hanoi guilty of violating the Geneva accords.

It should be mentioned that the Polish delegate dissented from the views expressed in the special report, because he considered them too favorable to South Vietnam, submitting a separate statement of his own. The following is quoted from the report as submitted by our friends, Canada and India:

Since the presentation of the 11th interim report, the situation in Vietnam has shown signs of rapid deterioration. The Commission is obliged to make this special report to the cochairmen with regard to the serious allegations of aggression and subversion on the part of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam against the Republic of Vietnam and the serious charges of violations of articles 16, 17, and 19 of the Geneva Agreement by the Republic of Vietnam, in receiving military aid from the United States of America (par. 4).

The International Commission wishes to draw the serious and earnest attention of the cochairmen to the gravity of the situation that has developed in Vietnam in the last few months. Fundamental provisions of the Geneva Agreement have been violated by both parties, resulting in ever-increasing tension and threat of resumption of open hostilities.

In this situation, the role of the Commission for maintenance of peace in Vietnam is being greatly hampered because of denial of cooperation by both the parties (par. 22).

Mr. Speaker, I cannot fully accept the statement that it was the Communists who cruelly shattered the 1954 agreements. This great country, whose leaders did not want the Geneva Agreements, whose Secretary of State refused to sign them, and whose President and Congress gave active encouragement to South Vietnam to unilaterally renounce them, must take a full measure of responsibility for this cruel shattering.

Today we know that we were wrong—that, as the President says of the agreement, "its purposes are still our own." Today we can look back and recognize that "the machinery of those agreements was tragically weak." But it was the machinery of law, and it held the promise of illustrating the principle that the will of a people expressed in elections supervised by an international body, can substitute for the rule of force and the destruction of war. We could have strengthened that machinery. We could have nourished that principle. In addition, whether we liked the precise results or not, we could have moved the whole world a long step down the road to the rule of law in world affairs instead of another rung up the ladder of escalation toward nuclear war.

As I pointed out on May 5, the policy of the United States, as expressed by the President in 1954, was:

In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly.

How much stronger would the United States be in the eyes of the world if we had stood by and supported this policy instead of undermining it? How much greater would be our credibility in insisting on elections to reunify East and West Germany or North and South Korea? How many festering sores of conflict all over the globe could be resolved peaceably by free election under U.N. supervision if we had acted to strengthen this principle instead of to sabotage it? And how much stronger would the United Nations and its peace-keeping functions be, if we had chosen a different course 11 years ago?

No human being can answer these questions today, for history gives us only one chance at decisions. However, if we truly support the principle of self-determination for all people—if we truly support the principle of resolving disputes by law rather than by force, and adhere to the goal of a world free from war—then we must look honestly and critically at our own errors of the past and seek to avoid them in the future.

It is fruitless to seek to assess blame for the decisions we made half a generation ago, but we can and should recognize some of the main factors in those decisions. The American people had just given a "mandate for change" to a new administration. A strong, new Secretary of State interpreted that mandate, with the approval of the President, to call not for coexistence with or containment of the Communist governments, but for a "rollback" of communism around the world. This "rollback"

was more important than the Geneva accords and justified our ignoring their provisions for a political settlement—if it appeared that the settlement might result in a government sympathetic to communism. Leading voices in the Congress supported and encouraged policies built on illusions—illusions such as the possibility that communism in China would disappear if we closed our eyes to its existence.

Within the CIA and the military were voices who advised that we had found a leader, in the person of Ngo Dinh Diem, who would cooperate with the United States in maintaining a strong, anti-Communist government in South Vietnam, regardless of the cost. And the military, of course, advised the administration that South Vietnam could be held if we wished to disregard the reunification election provisions of the Geneva agreement. Not only could it be held, but it could be held by the Vietnamese alone, provided we paid for and trained a large enough native army.

Other voices provided other justification—the sudden, vital importance of South Vietnam to the defense of the free world; the rich resources that would fall to communism if we neglected our clear duty to be "the guardians at the gate"; the eminent peril to the freedom-loving Cambodians, Indonesians, Laotians, Thais, Burmese, and others if South Vietnam "fell to communism." Today, of course, the major justification for continuing is merely that we cannot stop what we have been doing—otherwise it would appear that perhaps we should not have been doing it to begin with.

A tragic corollary to our denial of the elections called for in the Geneva Accords is that we justified it on the grounds that elections would result in a Communist government—a government that would eventually suppress individual freedom and liberty by force and terror. To prevent this, we maintained a family dictatorship which deprived large segments of the population of freedom and liberty by force and terror. We not only footed the bills for this dictatorship, paid 90 percent of the cost of a half-million-man army to prop it up, and paid for most of the foreign imports necessary for its survival, but we did so in such a way as to allow the wealthy merchants of Saigon to get wealthier at the expense of the U.S. taxpayer; the bureaucrats to line their pockets with graft; and the generals to divert payroll funds meant for their armies—provided by our military assistance program—into their own pockets.

If there were any important errors of judgment or practice that could have been made by the United States in connection with South Vietnam which were not made, I have yet to find them.

Today the government that we deal with in Saigon that is pictured as representing the people of South Vietnam is that collection of hand-picked generals, wealthy businessmen and landowners, and grafting bureaucrats who have managed to siphon enough out of the multibillion-dollar stream of American AID money to become independent for

life. They, naturally, want to continue this fortunate—for them—state of affairs.

The President, has said that "nor would surrender in Vietnam bring peace." I say that there is no possibility of victory in the situation we have created there. We can only hope that a benevolent deity will forgive us our mistakes and allow us another chance to do better. If we do not acknowledge our mistakes, even that is impossible.

I say further that "victory in Vietnam," whatever that term may mean, will not bring peace to the world. The American people delude themselves if they believe that the defeat of an enemy by virtue of superior military force anywhere in the world today will prevent the further outbreak of wars and revolutions all over the world. The conditions that bring forth wars and revolutions—the insatiable demands by the world's underprivileged for freedom, for justice, and for economic progress—will continue to break forth in violence as long as the demands are unmet and the causes unsolved.

I desire that my country be the voice for freedom, justice, and economic progress in the world. I believe that our success in that role will do immeasurably more to roll back communism than will our support of petty dictators around the world, our devotion to a crumbling status quo that claims to be anti-Communist, and our willingness to allow our foreign policy to be controlled by the machinations of the CIA.

I desire that my country lead the way toward a new world, a world based on law and respect for individual human beings. This is the road to victory today—not not just victory for the United States, but victory for mankind. The other road, which is the road followed by all the great empires of the past—the road of power exercised for the sake of power and national honor—leads but to oblivion.

REACTIVATING SHIPS FOR WAR DUTY

(Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. PRICE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have long called attention to the fact that the policy of the Department of Defense in distributing naval shipwork between Government and private shipyards was undermining the private yard capability on which we must depend in times of emergency.

It will be remembered that for many years the naval shipyards have been receiving the lion's share of this type of work, and that for the last 3 years the Congress directed that at least 35 percent should be awarded to the private yards. This minimal amount of Navy work has not stopped the closing of commercial yards nor has it prevented the escape of skilled workers to other more steady employment.

As a consequence, at this very moment, when ships for our Vietnam commitments must be put into service quickly,

many of our private shipyards are having great difficulty in finding trained workers in sufficient numbers. This acute situation is detailed in an August 1, 1965, article by Walter Hamshar, marine editor, the New York Herald Tribune. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of a badly premised policy which inhibits the ability of our shipyards to respond in times of emergency, I include Mr. Hamshar's timely article in the body of the RECORD at this point:

REACTIVATING SHIPS FOR WAR DUTY (By Walter Hamshar)

The reactivation of merchant ships from the Nation's reserve fleets for the military buildup in South Vietnam has created the problem the ship repair industry has been warning the Navy about for years.

And the solution of that problem will cost the Government—and the taxpayers—millions of dollars that would not have to be spent had the Navy provided more repair work to private shipyards, especially in the New York area, instead of allowing such yards to close while it funneled its work to Navy shipyards.

To meet the needs of the stepped-up war against the Vietcong, the Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service must double, at least, the flow of military supplies to the Far East. The MSTs, which has the responsibility of delivering all military supplies by ocean, has been seeking the extra merchant ship tonnage for the additional cargoes.

REACTIVATION

Almost 2 weeks before President Johnson's announcement Wednesday of the military buildup, the MSTs was frantically seeking to charter every suitable American merchant ship that was available. Unable to fulfill all its needs, the Navy service was forced to request the reactivation of ships from the Merchant Marine Reserve fleets.

As a starter, 14 World War II Victory ships have been withdrawn—4 from the Hudson River fleet—are being readied in various shipyards for service.

For future ship breakouts, the Navy has asked the Maritime Administration to conduct a survey of the ship repair industry to determine how many ships can be readied per month.

To the layman, the breakout of ships from reserve fleets may seem a simple, routine process of scraping off a few barnacles, oiling up the engines, and slapping a coat of paint over rust spots. Nothing could be further from what actually is necessary.

COMPLEX

The reactivation of a ship which has been idle for years involves 110 standard items and a thousand and one detailed items. All take time and money and skilled workers.

The Navy has ordered a crash program to get the ships in service early this month. A deadline of August 7 has been set for some of the vessels to be on berth so that they can load supplies for the increased forces in Vietnam.

A survey indicated that the deadline will not be met for most of the reactivated ships. The sky is the limit on overtime and men are working around the clock 7 days a week. But the trouble is a shortage of skilled workers.

Since the Navy began starving the private shipyards several years ago, the skilled men who were laid off have drifted to other industries. Expert machinists and mechanics of the type needed for reactivating merchant ships have no trouble getting shore jobs. And they are not eager to leave their present jobs for a temporary upsurge in shipyard work. Even welders are hard to get.

CAPACITY

"The skilled workers we have been able to keep are working as fast as they can, but

there is a limit to what one man can do," one yard official said.

The Maritime Administration is hoping to get the Victory ships reactivated at a cost of about \$250,000 a ship. A yard official laughed at the figure. He estimated it will be closer to \$405,000.

"When ships were reactivated for the Suez crisis the average was \$325,000 per ship," he said. "Now the ships are that much older."

STORED

Although the Maritime Administration has followed a preservation program, the sun, wind, rain, and salt air takes a heavy toll on idle ships. When ships are in regular service the crews look to the maintenance of cargo gear, engines, decks, and other equipment.

When a merchant ship is laid up in the reserve fleet, virtually everything movable that is exposed to the elements is stored in the vessel's holds. This includes booms, cable, navigating instruments, lifeboats, davits and a long list of equipment. The decks inside and the machinery are sprayed with oil. Bedding, table linen, crockery, crew furnishings are stored ashore. Compasses, chronometers, radio equipment is taken ashore to prevent it from being stolen.

Even lighting fixtures must be replaced because they have mysteriously disappeared during layup. Brass fittings for various equipment are almost invariably gone when the ship repairmen start looking for them.

Replacing and restoring, cleaning and painting all take time. Rusted-out plates must be torn out and new ones installed. Every welded seam must be checked inch by inch for corrosion during the long years of layup.

FLEET OF 1,600 SHIPS

Should the Vietnamese situation develop into a full-fledged world war the United States has a fleet of 1,600 ships laid up in various anchorages throughout the country. This would mean that theoretically a total of 1,600 ships would ultimately be available for war duties.

But only 960 of those ships have been given any form of preservation. The other 700 are mostly Liberty ships and were in the process of being sold for scrap at the rate of 100 a year for the last 10 years. To make the 960 priority ships serviceable on a crash basis as has been required for the 14 ships already withdrawn, would cost an average of \$400,000 to \$500,000 per ship. This would be about one-twentieth the cost of building new ships as was done for World War II. To restore the neglected ships will cost considerably more.

The Maritime Administration's preservation program had to be content to limp along at an annual budget of \$5.5 million. This reduced to about \$3,000 for each priority ship. The average age of the ships in the reserve fleet is 21 years. The average time each has been laid up is 15 years.

(Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. PRICE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GARMATZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, and the balance of this week, for personal reasons.

Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER), for today and tomorrow, on account of illness.

When his vagrant melancholy lifted, as it always did at the touch of wit or the challenge of a fresh idea, he could be a companion so beguiling that time folded its wings and crept away into a corner, until the cascade of talk at last came to an end.

He honored us all by refusing to stoop in order to conquer. Now we are left with a huddle of grief-stricken memories when only yesterday we had a vallant friend and a radiant champion.

Tread lightly, for here is a name certain to blossom in the dust.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 18, 1965]

HE NEVER LEARNED TO HIDE HIS SOUL

"We shall not come again
We never shall come back again
But over us all, over us all,
Over us all is—something."
—Thomas Wolfe.

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Twice he had come as close as a man could come to leadership of the American Nation. Yet no one noticed as, for a moment, Adlai Stevenson looked toward the caped statue of Franklin Roosevelt, walked a few hundred yards, grasped the thin steel columns of a sidewalk railing, and died.

Questions of man's survival, of war, and of human progress had very nearly rested on the qualities of his personal mind and will. The destiny of every man and woman he passed that afternoon was almost placed in his hand. Yet no one cheered or waved or even turned to stare.

For he had escaped power. And for a politician, power is the tool which etches out one man's figure from among his companions.

IMPRESSIVE QUALITIES

Would he have been a good leader of his country, or a great one? We will never know. Many deny it. And they give reasons which start to persuade, until we remember that they—or their counterparts in other years—has said the same of past leaders such as John Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt and, violently, of Abraham Lincoln.

The fact is no man who has not been President can survive analysis of his capacity for the task. Nor can we predict his qualities until they pass through the purification of power and responsibility. We do know he had more promise than most. We do know the impressive qualities of mind and spirit his career permitted him to reveal. We also know he was ambitious. For you do not run for President unless your ambitions are greater than those of other men.

Was that ambition tinged with self-doubt? It is for every man except the very dangerous. Did he have the courage of decision? His own words, public and in private conversation, cloud judgment. But perhaps they only mask the fact that never in his public life did he fail to decide when it was time to decide; except in 1960 when the shameful prospect of leading his party to a third defeat postponed judgment beyond the reach of action.

Where public issues were concerned he spoke—on the platform and in the meeting room—with a clarity of conviction few had courage to match. And on this question the judgment of those who knew him is disfigured by the tortured musings of a man who had never quite learned the trick of hiding his soul; whose confidence had been twisted and battered by defeat and by the indifference and contempt of lesser men, which finally killed him.

He was not, as some have said, marked by fate for failure. He was the victim of less mystical forces: bad luck, poor timing, unfortunate issues, a party too long in office, and an opponent who could not be defeated. Had 6 percent of American voters switched

to him in 1952 then all the hesitation and humility would today be regarded as the skillful genius of a master politician.

So we do not know, and will never know, if Adlai Stevenson would have been a good President of the United States. But we must be reluctant to believe that the judgment of so many who had desired his victory so furiously could have been so wrong.

Great men of affairs are either kings or prophets. Very few are both. And honor comes more reluctantly to prophets because they touch us more deeply. Adlai Stevenson never became a king, but he was a prophet. Death is already beginning to dissolve the masks of public failure and private personality which hide that recognition. It will become clearer as the self-justifying commentaries of those who scorned him in life begin to fade.

SEED ON UNPLOWED GROUND

I knew Adlai Stevenson as a colleague in my work for President Kennedy and, more recently for President Johnson. Both valued him most highly. Both had worked for his election to the office which they, not he, were to hold. Both knew, as others did not, what it took to bare yourself—ambitions and hopes—to the faithful, the indifferent and the hostile alike.

Many others in Washington, in these years, looked at him with a certain condescension. At times, thankfully only a few times, my own instinct was submerged in the need to be fashionable. But Adlai Stevenson will be mourned more deeply and remembered longer than any of these. It is not that millions loved him and millions more admired him because they did not know him. It is that closeness and ambition, envy and rivalry obscure the heart's truth. Yet that is the truth that finally matters; which selects the man from among the shadows, sadly past the hour when recognition might bring personal joy.

But though I knew him and admired him, opposed him in 1960 and occasionally worked with him thereafter, many can speak far more intimately than I.

I remembered best the Adlai Stevenson I never knew, when the world was young and the ringing phrases tumbled like the sowers seed on the unplowed ground.

In the fall of 1952 I was a senior in college in Massachusetts. John Kennedy was a young Congressman I had never met now running for the Senate. And Lyndon Johnson was the uncertainly familiar name of a Senator from Texas.

But Adlai Stevenson was my hero and my leader and my candidate for President of the United States. I never met him or even saw him nor had I read the carefully crafted texts of his speeches. But something was in the air. My tiny world suddenly seemed to widen. Events and the course of history were drifting back within the reach of a man's skill and brains. The pursuit of power, and its use, were not solely the object of greed and vaulting ambition but infused with service and nobility and the love of others.

It wasn't that he talked sense or spoke the truth harshly. It was the more profound act of telling us—my generation—what we knew but didn't realize. He revealed a world we already sensed was there, bared challenges we were aching to undertake. The words were the words of sacrifice but the music sang of meaning and purpose to a young man.

As much as any, he was the end of postwar America and the beginning of a time still nameless. We knew and still repeated the old political phrases and the outworn battle cries. But we did not understand them because the lines had been drawn in a different war, and it was not our war. Now finally, there was a language we could understand and make our own.

THE ELEVATED INTELLIGENCE

Eight dreary, near-tragic, years were to pass before that prophesy was to be fulfilled by different men. It is hard to overstate the extent to which he helped shape the dialog, and hence the purposes, of the New Frontier and then the Great Society. He dissolved the old, unserviceable simplicities and taught us to apply to the world the complex wisdom we have used so triumphantly in the affairs of our Nation; We could seek peace while resisting danger. Everyone who was not a friend was not an enemy. Agreement and accommodation could come from self-confidence as well as fear. By helping others we could strengthen ourselves. Particular problems could be resolved, but we must learn to live for generations with a troubled world. The contest was not simply between our system and communism, but between those who found security in dominion and those who found it in a world of strong and diverse lands.

And all these principles, and many more, he suffused with another welcome and shining truth: the pursuit of national self-interest was not inconsistent with the desire for justice and dignity and well-being for all the people of the world—that there was no basic unresolvable contradiction between realistic policies and high ideals.

To our domestic problems he brought the same elevated and critical intelligence. He told us our sights were too low, the course we had charted too narrow. In every area of our national life we not only could do more than we were doing but more than we thought. And he taught that wealth was not excellence, power was not greatness, the pursuit of abundance was not the pursuit of happiness.

After he spoke, no leader of his party nor the dialog of democracy itself, would ever sound the same again. He was eloquent and acclaimed for eloquence, but finally it was not how he spoke, but what he said that mattered. Others would bring new accents and perhaps even greater powers to leadership. But it had all begun in Springfield, Ill., in that hopeful dawn year of 1952.

CITIZEN-POLITICIAN CREATED

The most farsighted policies molder and dissolve, lose content and direction, in the hands of the mediocre and the indifferent. The Nation rests on the quality of its public men, and they in turn are shaped by the quality of American politics. Adlai Stevenson brought many individuals into Government who have enriched the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson. But this is the least of it. More than any man, he created the citizen-politician. He told an entire generation there was room for intelligence and idealism in public life, that politics was not just a way to live but a way to live greatly, that each of us might share in the passions of the age.

My first experience in national politics was in an overflowing, chaotic room of the volunteers for Stevenson. Many thousands had the same initiation. Today, the citizens groups, the volunteers, the clubs to discuss issues and the clubs to reform politics, are a force which every politician must confront, and which the best will welcome. Thus, he changed the face of American politics; enriching the democracy, providing a base on which talent could aspire to power, opening a gateway to public life through which many who never heard his voice will someday enter.

All these—ideas and men—are contributions to be remembered. But there was something more to Adlai Stevenson, a quality that resists thought and language alike. For none of this explains the fierce desire millions brought to his cause, the disappointed tears of many who never knew him, the deep impulse which could make even experienced

politicians forget commitment and interest alike to be at his side.

It was not the first time we have seen this quality, nor the last. But how rare it is in those who find their way to power.

Part of it was in his lesson. It was not a new lesson. It runs like a vein of light through the dark history of the race. It suffuses the religion and beliefs of every people. It says that man is more than the sum of his needs and desires and fears. It ennobles those who look beyond their own interest to great principle. It acclaims, not wealth and power, but the charity of the spirit and the reach of the heart.

LOVE FELT BY MILLIONS

This is what he wanted for the American people. And although we may never be equal to it, many loved him for thinking we could.

The rest was the man himself. You didn't need to know him to feel it, although knowing brought confirmation. There was a gentleness, a spaciousness of sensibility, a love which in unseen ways was felt by millions. He could laugh and be cynical. If he read these words he would joke about them, and he would deride this writing with soft self-deprecation. But all the wonderful humor, the urbanity, the captiousness was, in large part, a mask to protect himself from a world which so easily confused humility with weakness, sentiment with unreality, amplitude of understanding with failure of will. Many who met him were fooled. Millions who never met him knew the truth.

This is the secret of today's mourning and to his place in the play of passion clothed in fact which is history. People return what they receive. They believe in the man who believed in them and thus made them believe in themselves. They love the man who loved them and thus let them love themselves a little more. They honor the leader who told them they were better than they were and, in so doing, made it so.

He has often been compared to Hamlet. And those who make the comparison do so as a metaphor of irresolution. Hamlet is the story of a man who tries to understand and reach for certainty before he strikes. But he does strike; and for justice loses kingship and life while the election lights on a young and valiant captain.

Our judgment must echo Shakespeare's own when the new king stands beside Hamlet's body, saying:

"Let four captains
Bear Hamlet, like a soldier, to the stage;
For he was likely, had he been put on,
To have proved most royally * * *"

Fe. D. Church
L.B.J.'S NEWS CONFERENCE ON
VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, last Wednesday, President Johnson again defined the American purpose in Vietnam. He avoided any trumpet call for a wider war, focusing his attention upon South Vietnam. Our commitment—from the beginning—has always been confined to South Vietnam. It is in South Vietnam that the guerrilla war is being fought, and it is there that a solution must be found.

I was also reassured by the President's emphasis on our stated goal—a peaceful settlement at the conference table. In the past, I have strongly urged negotiations, in which I have believed the United Nations should play a role. On June 24 I called for free elections in South Vietnam, once the requisite internal order would permit them, and suggested that peace talks would have to include

the Vietcong. I am gratified that the President indicated his willingness to move in these directions.

In my judgment, the best assessment of the President's news conference was written by Walter Lippmann and published in the July 30 issue of the Washington Post, under the title "Realism and Prudence." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's column be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REALISM AND PRUDENCE (By Walter Lippmann)

The decisions taken by the President as the result of the review of the situation in Vietnam are, it seems to me, realistic, and as a result, the American position is strengthened and improved. The crucial issue which he had to resolve was what this country should do in view of the fact that the South Vietnamese Government has lost to the Vietcong the control of virtually all the highways and most of the villages and territory of South Vietnam. Should the United States volunteer to fight the war which Saigon has so very nearly lost, substituting American troops for the Vietnamese troops, taking military command of all the fighting forces and of the government in Saigon? Or should the United States defend its presence in South Vietnam for the purpose of negotiating a political settlement?

The difference between these two strategies is all the difference between, on the one hand, an unlimited and illimitable war that could escalate into total war, and, on the other hand, a limited war, as the President calls it a "measured" war, which is clearly within American military power, demands no exorbitant sacrifice, and keeps the struggle within the possibility of diplomatic negotiations. The President on Wednesday announced, if I understand him correctly, his choice between these two strategies. Although he repeated the grand formulas of a great war, in fact his decision as of now is to fight a limited war. The size of the callup is in accord with this decision: the additional troops are sufficient, or can be made sufficient, for a limited and defensive strategy. They would be absurdly inadequate if our objectives were the reconquest of South Vietnam. Instead of 125,000 men, the troops needed would, according to the usual formula of 10 to 1 for guerilla war, mean more nearly a million.

There is additional evidence from the official disclosures on Wednesday that the President has decided against a serious escalation of the war in North Vietnam. He has been under pressure to send the bombers into the heart of North Vietnam, into the area of Hanoi and Halphong, where are the industries and the population centers of the country. While it is never wise for a commander to say what he will not do, there is considerable evidence that the administration has decided not to bomb the population centers, and to avoid putting Hanoi in the position where, having nothing to lose in the north, it uses its formidable army to invade South Vietnam.

Moreover, high U.S. Government officials have let it be known that we do not intend to comb the countryside to eliminate the Vietcong from villages, but rather to confine ourselves to conventional military action.

Along with the decision to keep the war limited, the President has launched a strong diplomatic campaign for a negotiated peace. He has in the past proposed, or hinted at, most, perhaps all, of the elements of his campaign. But the combination he described on Wednesday is new and impressive. In calling upon the United Nations and all

member governments, severally or jointly, to bring the fighting to an end, he has, for the first time I think, given the mediators something concrete to talk about with Hanoi.

The President has agreed that the principles of the 1954 agreements, which are the declared war aims of Hanoi, are an acceptable basis of negotiation, and that we are prepared in South Vietnam, or in all Vietnam, to accept elections supervised by the U.N. This is contrary to the position taken by Secretary Dulles 10 years ago, and the President's willingness to return to "the purpose of the 1954 agreements" opens the door wide in principle to a negotiated settlement.

Probably, Hanoi will still refuse to negotiate. For the Vietcong and Hanoi are within sight of a military victory, not over the United States but over the Saigon Government, and it is by no means certain that General Westmoreland with his reinforcements can prevent that. But even if he cannot prevent it, the strategy adopted by the President will leave the U.S. Army invincible in Vietnam, with the United States exercising an influence which cannot be ignored in the eventual settlement.

JOHNSON'S BREAKTHROUGH ON TALENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, after a year in Europe on a Ford Foundation grant, Max Lerner is back in his role of one of the most perceptive social and political analysts of our day. His first column after returning discusses Adlai Stevenson, Arthur Goldberg, and the remarkable ability of President Johnson to put the right man in the right position.

Commenting on the appointment of Justice Goldberg as Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Lerner writes:

It is an exciting country that can offer this example of stripping away the inessential in order to get at the quality most needed, of talent seized imaginatively, reexamined, relocated. It is also exciting to find a man willing to give up a safe place in a snug harbor for life, and accept the risks of storm and battle anew.

I believe Senators will find this column of uncommon interest. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 30, 1965]

JOHNSON'S BREAKTHROUGH ON TALENT (By Max Lerner)

Returning to the battlefield after a more serene vacation month than anyone has a right to enjoy in our troubled time, one finds a profusion of events clamoring for comment—a death that left a scar on the Nation, a dramatic appointment, disclosures of the inside story of past events, emerging political battles, war decisions in the making. Such event clusters link past and present in an unbreakable web.

One is the death of Adlai Stevenson and the appointment of Justice Arthur Goldberg to his U.N. post. The Nation gave Stevenson, on his death, the kind of understanding and devotion that it had never given him during his life, much as most of us do when some good kind friend dies, whom we have neglected unconsciously and treated shabbily. We suddenly rediscovered in Stevenson a number of lofty qualities we might have noted earlier, in 1952 and 1956, when we not only managed to dissemble our love but kicked him down-

without being able to reach the gulf, Mobile was no longer useful to the Confederates.

There are so many histories within history, and so many famous people connected with Mobile that it would be hard to even begin saying which were the most important. There are many historical spots open to the public, including Fort Gaines, on Dauphin Island, and Fort Morgan, out on the point. But if one really wanted to see Mobile, the city, the time to get the proper atmosphere is during the annual Mardi Gras, started in 1831 (even before the one held annually in New Orleans).

Of modern Mobile County and City, there is much to see, too. The oil fields of Citronelle have opened up an entire new industry to Alabama and to the South east of the Mississippi. The State docks at Mobile ship Alabama merchandise all over the world, and included in shipments received, there are ores from South America for use in the steel mills of Birmingham.

The two main river systems of the State are the Alabama-Coosa-Tallahatchee, and the Warrior-Tombigbee. These two systems flow together just 45 miles north of the city of Mobile. A canal 125 feet wide and 12 feet deep at Mobile is part of the Intracoastal Waterway that stretches from Brownsville, Tex., all the way around the coast of the United States in the east to Malpe. All this water and the gulf coast make recreation a delight, and industry boom. Mobile and Mobile County can go only one way—the way of prosperity.

The Kentucky Lineage of Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article prepared by Mr. J. Emerson Miller, secretary of the Dr. Thomas Walker Family Association, in which he traces the Kentucky lineage of the late Adlai Stevenson to Dr. Thomas Walker, the first white man to enter what is now the Commonwealth of Kentucky back in 1750.

In a note accompanying the article, Mr. Miller stated that Ambassador Stevenson "took a deep pride in his Kentucky heritage, and cherished an unvarying love and affection for this State and its people, and "liked to point out that he was a Kentuckian once removed."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE KENTUCKY LINEAGE OF ADLAI STEVENSON
(By J. Emerson Miller, secretary, Dr. Thomas Walker Family Association)

"Kentucky lost a great and brilliant grandson in the death of Adlai Stevenson," Gov. Edward T. Breathitt said in expressing his grief at Stevenson's sudden and unexpected death.

The man who was twice Democratic presidential nominee, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, and former Governor of Illinois, was indeed a grandson of Kentucky. There is no family more closely identified with the early history of Kentucky or whose roots go more deeply in the soil of

the Bluegrass State than that of Adlai Ewing Stevenson. The Stevenson family tree spreads into all sections of the State and the late U.N. Ambassador's background is such that he was about as well known in Kentucky as he was in his native State of Illinois.

The first direct Kentucky ancestor of Stevenson's was Dr. Thomas Walker, a great-great-great-grandfather, who in 1750 crossed the Great Warrior's Path at Cumberland Gap with his exploring party, and became the first white man to set foot on our soil. He and his party camped for the night close to what is now the tannery near Middlesboro.

A paternal great-great-grandfather, Willis Green, born in 1752, removed to Kentucky from Culpeper County, Va., in 1779 by way of Cumberland Gap, represented this district in the general assembly, during the Revolutionary War served as ensign and lieutenant, and removed to the neighborhood of Stanford, in Lincoln County, where for many years he was the county clerk. He was married to Sarah Reed, daughter of the noted Indian fighter, Col. John Reed.

The next in line going back was Duff Green, who married as his first wife a Miss Barbour, while a daughter of his son Willis married Maj. James Barbour, who with his brother Richard Barbour owned the land where Barbourville now stands and which was named for them.

Duff Green married, secondly, Ann Willis, a daughter of Col. Henry Willis, founder of Fredericksburg, Va., who married Mildred Washington, only sister of Gen. George Washington.

Adlai's great-grandfather, Lewis Warner Green, noted clergyman and head of Centre College, Danville, married Mary Peachy Fry, a daughter of Thomas Walker Fry and his wife, Elizabeth Speed Smith.

Lewis Warner Green was named for his greater-great-grandfather, Col. Augustine Warner, Speaker of the Virginia House of Burgesses and his wife Mildred Reade, who was the 11th in descent from Edward III, King of England.

Martha, a sister of Thomas Walker Fry, married David Bell, of Danville, Ky., and was the mother of Josua Fry Bell, from whom Bell County was named. A great-granddaughter, Martha Bell Jackson, of Danville, represented Centre College at the Mountain Laurel Festival in 1933.

Another great-grandfather of Adlai Stevenson was Capt. James Speed, whose family was among the earliest settlers of Jefferson County. They came to Kentucky in 1782 and took a conspicuous part in the development of the State, Capt. James Speed assisting in the drafting of the State's first constitution. His sons and grandsons attained prominence in public life, the most eminent of these being James Speed, Attorney General in Lincoln's Cabinet, and Joshua Fry Speed, Lincoln's most intimate friend.

The Stevensons were among the first families to settle in Rowan County, N.C., where they lived as neighbors to Adlai Osborne, another ancestor of the Illinois Governor, and whose name he bears. The family moved to Kentucky at an early date.

In 1852 Adlai's paternal great-grandfather, John Turner Stevenson, removed to Bloomington, Ill., from the family's old home near Hopkinsville. His son, Adlai Ewing Stevenson, born in Kentucky, and educated at Centre College, was a lawyer and a Democrat in a stanchly Republican district but he got elected to Congress and was elected Vice President under Cleveland in 1892. He married the brilliant Letitia Green, four-time president-general of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution and one of the founders of the Parent-Teachers Association.

Adlai's father, Lewis Green Stevenson, acted as secretary to Vice President Steven-

son and served a term as secretary of State of Illinois. He ran for Governor of Illinois in 1916, and though defeated ran 60,000 votes ahead of Woodrow Wilson, the presidential candidate. He was married in 1892 to Helen Louise Davis, daughter of Pennsylvania-born Quaker, William O. Davis, publisher of the stanchly Republican Bloomington Pantagraph, one of central Illinois' richest and most influential newspapers.

Grandfather Davis married Eliza, daughter of Jesse W. Fell, who emigrated from Chester, Pa., in 1832, traveling part of the way on foot, and settled down to the practice of law. At Vandalia, first capital of the State, he met and roomed with a gangling young lawyer by the name of Abraham Lincoln, became his devoted friend, and suggested the Lincoln-Davis debates and played an important part in Lincoln's election.

Although a tyro in politics, as candidate for Governor of Illinois in 1948, Adlai Stevenson carried the State by a record 572,000 votes, the greatest plurality in the State's history, topping President Truman's State margin by more than a half million votes.

In 1955, Adlai Stevenson III, the late Ambassador's son, then a student at Harvard, met an attractive Kentucky girl, Nancy Anderson, studying at Smith College, daughter of Louisville advertising executive Warwick Anderson. Their marriage united two lineal descendants of Dr. Thomas Walker, Nancy's father being a great-great-grandson of the discoverer of Cumberland Gap. The couple have four children, Adlai Stevenson IV, age 9; Luey, age 7; 5-year-old Kate, and Warwick Anderson Stevenson, 2, named for his maternal grandfather.

The Sky Cavalry
The Sky Cavalry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD H. CALLAWAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday I spoke of the pride and confidence in which the people of my district hold the 1st Calvary Division—Airmobile—the outfit that has just been called upon to handle our efforts in Vietnam. On that same day a fine editorial appeared in the Atlanta Constitution by its Editor Eugene Patterson, describing the capabilities of the unit and voicing the hopes of all of us in the 1st Air Cavalry.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this in the Record and to verbally underscore Mr. Patterson's closing sentence, that "the State that cradled the sky cavalry sends it in with a salute and a prayer."

GEORGIA SENDS IN THE SKY CAVALRY (By Eugene Patterson)

Once more Georgia sends a division into battle. Many have gone out to fight wars from our bases. But uncoiling from Fort Benning to strike in Vietnam now is the most radically different kind of combat division since the advent of paratroops.

Until last month it was called the 11th Air Assault Division. It was an experimental unit. For 3 years it had been developing and testing a new Army tactic in and above the pine thickets and scrub flats of southwest Georgia.

The tactical dream was to create a full 15,000-man division that could deploy itself

terpreted the situation, is not offering either clarification or criticism.

In the good old days it was not considered ethical for a White House aide to tell all in public, once the President he served was dead or retired. This was good manners, if nothing more.

A President has a right to let his hair down once in a while, and should feel that what he blurts out in a moment of temper is not going to be interpreted to posterity as meaning that he really thinks Cabinet member X is a stupid oaf or a two-faced s.o.b.

This was sound, politically and ethically. We know all that is worth knowing about F.D.R.'s regime, about Mr. Truman's, General Eisenhower's, even if we lack the juicy tidbits that their Presidential advisers could have supplied had they dared to take pen in hand.

But now it appears the Nation and the world are going to be treated to every big and little, whimsical and cozy, highlight in the big-time political career of John F. Kennedy.

In the process—as the first accounts appear from Schlesinger and Kennedy confidant Ted Sorenson—various living persons are getting the knocks that used to be withheld until they were dead.

Aside from the assault on Rusk by Schlesinger, we can also get along without the reshapes and elaborations on the Bay of Pigs fiasco, especially since they cast new elurs on the way Allen Dulles operated as Central Intelligence Agency chief.

And we dislike the recent Schlesinger effort to recite chapter and verse in an effort to show that Mr. Kennedy didn't really want Mr. Johnson as his 1960 running mate, nor did brother Bobby.

If true, the Kennedys were not the smart politicians they were supposed to be, because Richard Nixon would have won in 1960 without Mr. Johnson on the Democratic ticket.

There are some other books besides Schlesinger's and Sorenson's, coming out soon, that are supposed to give more inside lowdown accounts of Mr. Kennedy's days in the White House. The authors or coauthors include Pierre Salinger, Lawrence O'Brien and Kenny O'Donnell.

Let's hope that they don't intentionally besmirch the living or inadvertently reflect on the dead simply for the sake of making a fast buck.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 28, 1965]

KISS AND TELL

"Kiss and tell" is something almost universally regarded with contempt. When the telling violates confidence and records off-hand comments, it is unethical and bad-mannered.

When it takes advantage of a dead man who can neither confirm nor deny published statements, it becomes an extraordinarily dirty business—especially when it is done for personal profit and political revenge.

We have been furnished prime examples of tattling in the excerpts, appearing in national magazines, from books written by former White House aids Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Theodore C. Sorensen.

Supposed to be inside accounts of the high and low spots of the Kennedy administration, these memoirs do a great disservice to the Presidency. No one can know whether what they reveal is the truth or not.

Because many of the statements are unverifiable, they leave defenseless the persons whose reputations they tarnish.

We are told, for instance, that President Kennedy intended to get rid of Secretary of State Rusk, and we are treated in the process to a venomous appraisal of the Secretary by Schlesinger. The damage thus done to Rusk, and to his continued effectiveness as head of the State Department, could be serious.

In other portions of the memoirs, the impression is given that Kennedy did not really want Lyndon Johnson as his running mate in 1960, and offered him the vice-presidential nomination in the expectation that he would turn it down. This is contrary to other accounts of the ticket-framing episode. It also downgrades the political wisdom of John F. Kennedy, who doubtless recognized the voting support that Johnson would bring to his ticket.

Sorensen and Schlesinger are only the first of a stream of writers eager to tell all that they saw and heard from various vantage points in the White House during the Kennedy administration. If the Presidency is degraded, if someone happens to be hurt by rumor and gossip, it is just too bad. The lure of the fast buck is often irresistible.

It would appear, in the case of the former White House assistants, that the power and the dignity of the Presidency, and their nearness to it, went to their heads. It is to be hoped that future Presidents will be spared this kind of arrogant conduct, and the mad rush to "tell all," for a price.

The President should not have to look behind curtains to make sure that some future writer of White House memoirs is not hiding there, notebook in hand. He should not have to worry about every remark he makes—and some not made at all—appearing later in a bestseller authored by one of his confidants.

The eruption of "inside stories" of the Kennedy years is not history. It is indecent exposure.

EXCERPT FROM AN ARTICLE BY RUTH MONTGOMERY

It is almost morbid, however, to plunge a knife into the hard-pressed Secretary of State while he is engaged in delicate maneuvers to try to prevent Vietnam from plunging the world into the holocaust of war.

Does it help American at this critical juncture to have Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., write a book in which he declares that Mr. Kennedy planned to replace Secretary Rusk because of "one muddle after another," at the State Department and Rusk's "reluctance to decide" questions of policy?

Schlesinger, a leading light in the left-wing Americans for Democratic Action, says Rusk's mind is an "irrevocably conventional" one that mistrusts "the flashy or sensational."

All we can say to that is, Thank heavens. Surely America is on a hot enough seat without having a Secretary of State who rejoices in "the flashy or sensational" approach to diplomacy.

The tattling Mr. Schlesinger writes that during the Kennedy administration Rusk lived "under the fear of inadequacy and humiliation." This would suggest that Rusk has remarkable foresight. Perhaps he had a premonition of what Schlesinger would try to do to him as soon as Mr. Kennedy's reins were removed.

The Real Alabama—Part XXXVII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the most populous county in the First Congressional District of Alabama is Mobile County.

The history of the county provides as fascinating a study as perhaps any county in the Nation. It is rich with Indian history, French and Spanish exploration and settlement, and Civil War activity.

A brief summary of the county's history follows here, and it is my hope that it may stimulate additional interest in Mobile County, where our citizens always extend a cordial welcome to friends and visitors:

MOBILE COUNTY, ALA.

Mobile County is in the extreme southwestern corner of the State and is bounded by Washington County on the north, by the Mobile River (after the joining of the Tombigbee and the Alabama Rivers) and Baldwin County on the east, by Mobile Bay and the Gulf of Mexico on the south, and by the Mississippi line on the west. The county was created by a proclamation of Gov. David Holmes of the Mississippi Territory on December 18, 1813, upon after Gen. James Wilkinson took possession of the town of Mobile for the United States. The county was named for the Maubila Indians, called Mobile by the French, who named the post established in 1702 Fort Louis de la Mobile.

DeCraney's map of 1733 shows an Indian town, Nanihaha, probably built by Apalachees just south of the junction of the Mobile and Tombigbee Rivers on the Mobile River. Another town, Chactaux, in the angle of the Dog River and Mobile Bay, was probably settled by Chattos Indians who were settled there by Iberville. Several other Indian towns were shown in regions where water surrounded the town on three sides. Many mounds containing interesting artifacts were found, also.

Fort Louis de la Mobile was located at Twenty-Seven Mile Bluff on the Mobile River, and Fort Louis de la Mobile 2d, located between Church and Esclava Streets extending from the riverfront to Royal Street in Mobile, was built by Bienville in 1711, after the French were driven from Twenty-Seven Mile Bluff by river floods. Fort Conde, where now the headquarters of the Colonial Dames of America stands, was built in 1717 by Crozat. To better understand how Mobile has been under five flags, a list of dates is helpful:

In 1702: Village established at Twenty-Seven-Mile Bluff (French).

In 1711: Village of Mobile moved to mouth of Mobile River.

In 1720: Capital of Louisiana Territory moved to New Orleans. (Mobile).

In 1763: By secret treaty, Mobile surrendered to English, October 20.

In 1779: Spaniards captured Mobile.

In 1813: United States takes possession of Mobile.

In 1817: Alabama becomes a State of the Union.

In 1864: A Confederate stronghold—the South's only major city that did not fall to the Union.

In 1865: Back in the Union.

The Battle of Mobile Bay during the Civil War was one of the very important happenings in the history of both Mobile and of the Civil War. The Federal fleet, consisting of 4 ironclads flanking 14 wooden ships of war lashed together in pairs as they sailed into battle, with Fort Morgan on the east and Fort Gaines on the west, sailed against the Confederate fleet of 1 ironclad ram and 3 wooden ships, and won the victory. It was after one of his ironclads had been sunk by Confederate mines that Admiral Farragut of the U.S. Navy, climbed into the rigging of his ship to see above the dense smoke of battle and yelled the now famous words, "Damn the torpedoes—full speed ahead!" Historians wonder why Admiral Farragut did not continue on up the bay and capture Mobile, but it was probably because

into combat entirely by air, substituting helicopters for ground transportation and entering the battlefield in order—not scattered as parachute infantry sometimes is, and not dependent on Air Force aviation.

Commanded by Maj. Gen. Harry W. O. Kinnard, the experimental division was frequently levied upon for Army helicopter pilots to go to Vietnam. A large proportion of those pilots who have been transporting and supporting the South Vietnamese troops through the years came out of Fort Benning.

But the gaps were filled; other Army pilots poured into Columbus to man the division's 400 aircraft, most of them helicopters. Last month the experimental days ended. The division was christened with the honored name and the spectacular shoulder patch—black horse's head on a yellow field—of the 1st Cavalry Division.

Now this air mobile division is ready and headed for combat. With its own aviation it can pick itself up by its bootstraps and move into battle once the Air Force and Navy land it in Vietnam. The soldiers who will ride the helicopters into battle are air-trained and air-oriented. If any U.S. ground unit can take effect against the hit-run tactics of the Vietcong guerrillas in the Vietnamese delta or central highlands, this one will.

Not bound to movement by ground or road, it will be hard to ambush. Swiftly mobile, it can drop troops into swift counterstrikes wherever guerrillas strike. Trained as a unit, it can deliver blows in massive strength, even at night. It is not bound to foxholes in a perimeter, but can drop from the sky into any battlefield—and climb away from any battlefield into the sky. Large units can hedgehop into an enemy's rear, operate, then hedgehop out. It is the best strike force against guerrillas that the Army can devise. These will be the shock troops in Vietnam.

Now the brave young Americans of this newest U.S. assault force move away from their Georgia homes for their combat test. The State that cradled the sky cavalry sends it in with a salute and a prayer.

Abe Fortas Named to Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives have expressed their criticism of the appointment of Abe Fortas to the Supreme Court. I want to go on record congratulating President Lyndon B. Johnson on his choice.

Mr. Fortas has been in the forefront of liberal causes for many, many years. It is common knowledge that Abe Fortas has argued and won legal cases which have become judicial landmarks. His varied legal experience, his brilliant intellectual background, and his accomplishments in Government can lead one only to the conclusion that Mr. Fortas is eminently qualified to assume the responsibilities of the high office to which he has been named.

It is my privilege to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of July 30 supporting this appointment.

The editorial follows:

MR. FORTAS TO THE COURT

A President may mold the course of national affairs for 8 eights, but the influence exerted by this appointments to the Supreme Court is more likely to be felt for decades or even generations. There can be no assurance that any appointee will measure up to the intellectual demands of the future, that he will exhibit the qualities of flexibility and empathy that are essential if the Constitution is to remain a living document. The President is compelled to base his critical decision on the candidate's past career, and by that standard his choice of Mr. Abe Fortas must be accorded a high rating.

The great strength of Mr. Fortas, who has for long been the President's intimate legal adviser, lies in the breadth of his experience and accomplishments. A brilliant law student and for a time a teacher at the Yale University Law School, he went on to a precociously successful career in the Government, first with the Securities and Exchange Commission and then as Harold L. Ickes' Under Secretary of the Interior.

After leaving the Government service, Mr. Fortas entered upon the private practice of law and soon rose to an eminent place in that profession. It is a tribute to Mr. Fortas' talents as a lawyer that his formidable reputation in the corporate world was acquired in spite of his attachment to various unpopular causes which challenged his innate sense of justice. During the McCarthy era he was not afraid to raise a strong voice against those who were bent upon destroying civil liberties under the banner of anti-communism.

More recently Mr. Fortas argued and won two cases which have become judicial landmarks. The Durham case, which he argued before the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, has done much to make the legal concept of mental illness more compatible with modern views of psychiatrists. In the Gideon case it was Mr. Fortas' powerful brief that led the Supreme Court to reverse its previous position and rule that States must provide counsel for indigents under criminal charges.

Appointments to the Supreme Court rarely if ever command universal approval. There are those who had hoped that the President would appoint a legal philosopher, and others would have urged him to look among the distinguished jurists of the lower Federal courts. But since facile predictions about the role of new justices have often proven egregiously wrong, it is hazardous to argue that the Court can be balanced or consciously leavened with an appointment from a campus, a court, or the political arena.

Whether judged by his intellectual capacity, his legal experience, or his deep concern over civil liberties and civil rights, Mr. Fortas is admirably equipped to take his place on the Court, and there is every reason to believe that he will serve it with great distinction.

The World Population Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most heartening things about this session of Congress is the sharpened interest in, and awareness of, problems posed by the world population explosion. Senator GRUENING is presently holding hearings in the other body on a bill intro-

duced by himself and several of his colleagues. Nine of us have introduced substantially identical bills in the House of Representatives.

Public interest and awareness in the matter is growing. Increased discussion in the press and in Congress is having a good effect. In place of emotions people are now talking about the facts of the problem. The Nation is realizing, I believe, that the population explosion is one of the greatest challenges facing us today. It is a great pleasure thus to read in the Washington Post a new series of articles, entitled "Our Crowded Earth," by Jean M. White. I think these articles state well the problems and the prospects. I commend them to every thinking American.

The initial article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 1, 1965]

THE POOR ARE ENGULFING THE EARTH: THE "POPULATION EXPLOSION"—ACTUALLY, A HOLIDAY FOR DEATH—IS OCCURRING WHERE IT'S LEAST SUPPORTABLE

(By Jean M. White)

In just 35 years—when many of us still will be around—it is very likely that there will be twice as many people on earth as there are today.

The time to do anything about that, if we had wanted to, was yesterday. The population problem is here and now and grows bigger by at least 1¼ million people each week.

Population projections used to be interesting mathematical exercises enabling demographers to predict when a standing-room-only sign would be posted on a crammed earth. But today we are finding that runaway population is bound up with many of our big problems: hunger, poverty, illiteracy, economic stagnation, political instability.

It will touch the very quality of life for those being born today. Yet a recent Gallup poll showed that only 3 out of 10 Americans who had heard of the population problem were at all worried about it.

Why should we suddenly get excited about population growth? Here are some things to consider:

A NEW DIMENSION

The human family is growing at a faster rate than ever before in man's history. This is the new, alarming dimension of the population problem—the rate.

Human multiplication is self-accelerating, like compound interest. It spurts upward in geometrical progression: 2-4-8-16-32-64-128. The annual rate at which it is growing has doubled in the last decade, from 1 to 2 percent.

This increase may not seem extraordinarily high until you follow the spiral of geometrical progression. If the human race had begun with a single couple at the time of Christ and increased at a rate of 2 percent a year, there now would be 20 million people for every person now alive—or 100 people on each square foot of earth.

The current world population is 3.3 billion. It will take only 15 years to complete the fourth billion. The fifth billion will follow in just 10 years after that.

THE DANGER SPOTS

Most of this population growth is in the underdeveloped countries, which can afford it the least. There a powder keg of social unrest and political instability is building up as runaway growth smothers efforts to give a little better life to millions of people who are ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed.

Like the Red Queen, the poor countries have to run as fast as they can just to stay in the same place—bare subsistence for their people. By the time the Aswan Dam is com-

pleted, Egypt's population is expected to have grown so much that the new irrigated lands will merely provide food enough for the additional people.

PLENTY AND PENURY

At a time of "revolution of rising expectations," the world's poor are finding their hopes frustrated. The world is rapidly coalescing into widely separated groups of "haves" and "have nots."

In 1963, North America and Western Europe had 17 percent of the world's population and 64 percent of the world's income, as measured in the value of goods and services produced. Asia had 56 percent of the world's population and 14 percent of its income.

Today, roughly a third of the population is in the capitalist world, another third is in the Communist camp and the last third is uncommitted. In Latin America and the Far East, runaway populations are creating more poverty and misery in which communism can breed.

THE ROAD TO FAMINE

The world's already hungry countries are growing more people than food to feed them. Some demographers and agricultural experts are warning of the threat of serious famine by 1980.

In Latin America, Asia, and Africa, food production is growing only about two-thirds as fast as the population. Per capita food production is actually declining in many of these countries and has slipped below levels of 25 years ago.

When people have to eat what they grow just to survive, there is nothing left to invest in better seeds, fertilizers and pesticides to increase food production. What science might do with algae gardens and sea farms is too far in the future to fill bellies already gnawing.

The United States has long been helping to feed millions of Indians with its food-for-peace program. But the way the world is, there can be no common trough for all men.

Last March, B. R. Sen, director general of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, warned that the world must raise food productivity and curb population in the next 35 years or face "disaster of an unprecedented magnitude." The alternative, he added, is that "mankind will be overtaken again by the old Malthusian correctives: famine, pestilence and war."

A CRISIS AT HOME

For Americans, the population problem is not just that of faraway places. The United States is having its own troubles at home in its brave new urban world.

Think about 350 million Americans—nearly double the number today—using some 300 million cars at the turn of the century. (It is not that far away; children born today will be 35 years old then.)

Then think of the new classrooms, roads, jobs, houses, taxes for social services. Think of the jammed buses, lengthened commuting time, increased pollution of water and air, the search for precious open space and privacy.

Rapid population growth in the United States—we are growing at a rate 50 percent above that of Western Europe and close to the world pace—is aggravating urban ills and perpetuating poverty in the midst of abundance. Some see our high rate of growth as a real threat to the amenities and esthetics of our preferred way of life.

In its study of world population growth, the National Academy of Sciences emphasized the population problem in these words:

"Other than the search for lasting peace, no problem is more urgent. Nearly all our economic, social, and political problems become more difficult to solve in the face of uncontrolled population growth."

THE REAPER REFUSED

What is the reason for the speed of growth that lies behind these population problems? The answer is a matter of simple arithmetic: births minus deaths.

There has been no sudden burst of fertility to set off the "population explosion" (demographers cringe at the use of this phrase). Birth rates haven't gone up. But death rates have dropped dramatically.

Man now is practicing effective death control without balancing this with equally effective birth control. It is ironic that one of man's great humanitarian achievements—the control of "mass killer" diseases—has created a new critical problem of runaway population which, in turn, raises a threat to life.

The dilemma is neatly summed up by the National Academy of Sciences report: "Either the birth rate of the world must come down or the death rate must go back up."

The only choice—for the earth cannot contain or support population growth at the present rate over a long time—is between humane birth control and the cruel equalizer of death. In a way, the bogey of Malthusianism, apparently buried a century ago, has risen again.

ALL IN A DECADE

The sudden, spectacular drop in death rates, particularly infant mortality, has come chiefly in the developing countries. Indeed, the lowest death rates in the world today are not in the United States and Western Europe but in such countries as Malaysia, Taiwan, and Puerto Rico, with their younger populations.

Modern medicine, vaccines, and pesticides have sharply cut death rates in a matter of a few years. In Ceylon, after DDT spraying had largely eradicated malaria, the death rate fell 57 percent in less than a decade—while the population increased more than 80 percent and per capita income declined.

A low 20th century death rate (about 10 per 1000) is now combined with a medieval birth rate (40 to 50 per 1000) to send population spiraling upward.

Europe went through a "demographic transition" (changeover from high birth and high death rates to low birth and low death rate) before achieving its nearly stable population of today. But there the decline in the death rate came gradually over many decades starting with the early 19th century.

After about 1875 (France was earlier), birth rates began to drop in European countries. Over the next 60 to 75 years, millions of couples made personal decisions to limit family size against the opposition of both church and state. There had been no advances in contraceptives, so they relied on such folk methods as withdrawal. Marriages were delayed, particularly in Ireland.

To help it through its transition, Europe also had the safety valve of emigration. But the 34 million who emigrated from Europe to the United States from 1820 to 1955 represent less than a single year's population growth in Asia today.

A VICIOUS CIRCLE

Unlike Europe, the developing countries today don't have time for gradual adjustments to balance birth and death rates. They are caught on a treadmill. Rapid population growth is blocking the modernization they need to achieve the conditions—industrialization, mass education, urbanization, literacy—to bring their birth rates down.

"The past is not relevant for the developing countries today," says Irene B. Taeuber, a noted demographer. "There must be a new pattern. Something has to happen that never happened before. They must cut birth rates either before or during the process of economic development."

President Eisenhower, who 10 years ago felt that birth control was not a proper concern

of governments, has explained that he abandoned this view after seeing the erosion of foreign-aid programs by population growth.

In a recent speech on the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, President Johnson called for all nations to face "the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations" and pointed out that less than \$5 invested in population control is worth \$100 invested in economic growth.

ECONOMIC STALEMATE

If population is growing at a rate of 2.5 or 3 percent a year—as it is in many of the developing nations—it takes that same rate of economic growth to stay even. It comes down to a kind of holding operation at miserably low standards of living.

It takes 9 percent of capital investment to generate a 3-percent increase in income. It will take heroic efforts to achieve the United Nations' goal of 5-percent annual growth in underdeveloped countries in this "decade of development." Expanding population growth also brings a heavy burden of child dependency. In the developing countries, more than 40 percent of the population is under 15 years of age. It is 25 to 30 percent in the West.) That imbalance puts heavy demands on health and education services.

Once, the subject of population control—which implies birth control—was politically taboo and considered too sensitive for public discussion. Now governments are speaking out on the need for action.

President Johnson's historic 25 words in his state of the Union address lifted the hush-hush attitude of the U.S. Government. A Senate subcommittee under Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, is holding hearings on the need for birth control information here and abroad.

The United Nations will hold its Second World Population Conference in Yugoslavia late this summer. For the first time, family planning is on the agenda—by demand.

The developing countries themselves are acting. Egypt, India, Pakistan, Japan, and South Korea have made family planning a part of national policy. There are government supported or sponsored projects in Ceylon, Taiwan, Turkey, Tunisia, Thailand, Malaysia, Barbados, Puerto Rico, and Hong Kong.

Pope Paul VI has said that he hopes the Catholic Church can soon redefine its stand on birth control.

For whatever term is used—family planning, fertility control, population control, responsible parenthood—the issue comes down to the deeply emotional subject of birth control.

The issue touches the very fabric of society, centuries of cultural traditions and deeply held beliefs. There are many barriers to its introduction: illiteracy, nationalistic pride, the peasant desire for sons to work the fields and provide social security in old age, the low status of women, the tradition of early marriage, contraceptive costs.

People have always been ahead of governments in the limitation of family size. Government can help set the climate, but individual couples must make the final decisions—as they did in Europe.

Mrs. Taeuber, the demographer, feels that the change in attitude toward birth control has now reached the ordinary man as well as his governments.

"I have been to Indian villages," she says. "These people are shrewd. They have survived where we might not have. They pull out old maps of land holdings a century ago and the divisions today, with more and more children living. Population is no abstraction to them."

Attitude polls have shown that the Chicago slum dweller, the Mexican factory worker, and the Indian villager alike want to limit the size of their families. All want to give their children a chance at a better life.

August 2, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190002-7

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—APPENDIX

A4239

CHEAP NEW CONTROL

Along with the change in attitudes is the recent progress in contraceptive technology. The intrauterine device—IUD—costs only a few cents and has proved dramatically effective in pilot projects. Once inserted, it can control fertility over months and years. "Control" is an important word here. Frank W. Notestein, president of the Population Council, a private institution which has spent \$20.4 million on the world's population problems, emphasizes that the object of a population policy is not to tell a couple how many children they may have. Rather, it is to give them "the basic right to choose freely."

Most population experts feel that population doesn't have to be stabilized to the point of no growth. They see it as a choice between uncontrolled growth and a gradual increase at a rate that will allow for improvement of the human lot.

Population projections are not predictions. If fertility is decreased, the United Nations has projected a possible 5.3 billion figure at the turn of the century rather than the 7 billion in prospect if current trends continue.

And once the break is made, the leveling off effect will be cumulative, just as the present rapid growth is self-accelerating.

Lobby Campaign Hurts Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am very much disturbed about the lobby campaign being conducted by the milling, baking, and cereal interests against the wheat proposal contained in the farm bill. This amounts to still more fancy footwork designed to confuse the consumer and deprive the American farmer from sharing in our general prosperity.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman deserves huge thanks for his tireless and extremely able efforts in behalf of our farmers, indeed all rural Americans, and I would like to submit for the Record an excellent analysis of the proposed wheat legislation as discussed in one of our great newspapers, the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

It is high time to stop begrudging the 2 or 3 cents the wheat farmer gets out of a loaf of bread. The most dramatic success story of this century is not a story of military might, industrial production, or the conquest of space. It is the story of the American farmer—the only man the Russians and Chinese Reds have found it impossible to compete with.

The analysis follows:

THE BREAD SUBSIDIES

Chairman HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, of the House Agriculture Committee is worried that the opposition to the wheat proposal will bring about defeat of the new farm legislation which is expected to come before Congress shortly.

The wheat proposal would shift the cost of the subsidy on wheat that is used in the United States from the Treasury to the wheat processing industries through imposi-

sition of a processing tax. This would raise the farm price of such wheat by about 50 cents a bushel.

Some milling, baking, and cereal interests are campaigning strongly against the proposal, claiming it would increase the cost of bread by 2 cents a loaf. There seems to be little doubt that the measure would result in some increase in bread prices. Proponents of the measure claim the increase would be only a penny or less per loaf. It is difficult to arrive at an exact figure on this because neither side specifies whether it is talking about the 1-pound loaf of bread, which is considered the basic unit, or larger loaves.

In fact, it is difficult to discuss bread prices at all except in generalities because they vary considerably from place to place in the United States. Bread prices are relatively reasonably in the Midsouth where competition between big bakers is sharp. Bread prices in California, though, are another story. It is reported that wholesale bread prices there are a good deal higher than retail prices in this area.

In considering national legislation, therefore, about the best that can be done is to accept the figures of the U.S. Department of Agriculture which represent a national average.

These figures show that the retail price of a pound loaf of bread has crept up steadily each year since 1947 at least. The price in 1947 was 11.9 cents and in 1963-64 it was 20.7, according to the Department's figures.

Little, if any, of this increase can be attributed to wheat prices received by the farmers. The farm value of the wheat in such a pound loaf of bread has hovered between 2.3 cents and 2.7 cents through all those years.

So, if the new legislation causes a bread price increase due to higher wheat prices, it will be the first time in 18 years or more that the farmer will have received such an increase. The other increases have gone to pay higher wages to workers in the milling and baking industries, to pay for increases in costs of packaging and distribution and to pay higher prices for other bread ingredients.

Whatever the outcome of this debate, it has served to make one point more clear. That is that the farm subsidies as they have been paid for many years have also been consumer subsidies. They have been hidden and have been relatively small on each unit of food the consumer has purchased at the retail outlets, but they have been there all the time.

The Bracero Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial by Raymond Moley which appeared in the July 19, 1965, edition of Newsweek, entitled, "The Bracero Blunder":

THE BRACERO BLUNDER

(By Raymond Moley)

LOS ANGELES.—The scarcity of farmworkers is a hotter subject in California this summer than the weather in the Imperial Valley. This crisis in agriculture, California's largest industry, was caused by the termination of the bracero program on Jan-

uary 1. The program was adopted in 1951 as a means of regulating the movement of Mexican farmworkers, braceros, into the United States in the summer and fall. Under the plan, administered by the U.S. Department of Labor and validated by the governments of the United States and Mexico, large numbers of such workers were admitted for a period of 6 to 12 weeks, were paid wages equal to those of Americans and were required to return after the harvest to their homes below the border. Most of the same workers returned year after year to the same employers. It was mutually profitable.

The pressure for the termination of the bracero program came from the AFL-CIO, largely because of its desire to unionize farmworkers. Liberals in Congress supported the termination of the program because of their deluded belief that it would reduce unemployment in the large industrial centers. Union labor has not been able to supply workers necessary to the harvest. And no unemployed worker now enjoying Government benefits is willing to migrate to another State for a temporary job.

HEADACHE FOR HOUSEWIVES

The impact upon California agriculture has been most severe. Many millions have been lost because of unharvested, rotting produce. And the flow of money into the State from exports to the East and abroad has been drastically curtailed.

As a result of this debacle, housewives elsewhere in the Nation have been confronted with rising prices for the many products imported from California and other States in the Southwest. In New York one purchaser of a head of lettuce after hearing the price asked that it be "gift wrapped." This rise in prices will continue as the various crops ripen on into September and October. And after that, the prices of canned goods will rise during the winter.

As the crops ripened this spring, the Department of Labor attempted to supply the need for workers by recruiting high school students in the States west of the Mississippi into what are called A-teams. Indians were bestirred from their abodes to the east and north and transported to the fields. But the high school boys—athletes back home—found the work too hard and the sun too hot, and the teams melted away. College students who a few months ago were standing up for their rights found stooping over in the fields to earn a few dollars quite another matter. Of 300 Indians recruited in the Dakotas who were flown in at a cost of \$6,400 to Salinas growers, all but 20 vanished within a few days.

THE HUMAN SIDE

The cream of the comedy is a notice that the war on poverty program is spending \$106,000 in Oxnard to educate and train 12 community advisers and leaders to train seasonal workers. According to the person doing the organizing, there isn't any teaching material ready, but that will be developed in time. It will take more uplifters to develop techniques. If workers were available, growers could easily enough tell them what to do.

A lasting loss to California is the trend of large growers to lease lands in Mexico and develop them along with Mexicans under more tolerable conditions in a country which has no Secretary Wirtz to "help" with their problems. California can ill afford this strain on its economy at this time because in several communities I have visited there are signs of declining business.

There is a human element in the termination of the bracero program. While the bleeding hearts in the Washington regime are spending billions to help the poor in Egypt, India, and elsewhere abroad, and while there is much talk about the Alliance for Progress, the Federal Government has visited a cruel hardship on the people of our nearest neighbor to the south. The termination of the

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190002-7

August 2, 1965

bracero program has hacked away the livelihood of tens of thousands of Mexican workers, for this visit to the north had come to be their way of life. Their feelings can well be imagined.

Free On Bray
**United States at War—Time To Beat
 Drums, Not Breasts**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, if there is any confusion or misunderstanding in the United States over our objectives and aims in southeast Asia, it is among those clamoring so loudly for negotiations and withdrawal—the peace-at-any-price crowd. This is made quite clear in the following column by William S. White that appeared in the *Monday, August 2, 1965, Washington Post*:

**UNITED STATES AT WAR—TIME TO BEAT DRUMS,
 NOT BREASTS**

(By William S. White)

As the fog of war thickens over Vietnam, where by any standard a major American action at arms is now unfolding, other fogs of quite different ilk are lifting here at home.

The national atmosphere, though undoubtedly more dangerous than before, is at all events now burned free of a great deal of vaporous nonsense.

No longer can it be denied by any responsible public official or private man that the most vital of American interests are involved in this struggle against Asian Communist aggression. If 125,000 American troops standing in Vietnam are not enough to give somber refutation to this sort of pettifogging, there is in addition the solemn declaration of the President of the United States: " * * * this is really war."

No longer can it be suggested by any responsible American, public or private, that this country is somehow unreasonably refusing to "negotiate" with a Communist invader who a score of times has scorned any honorable discussion—and still does.

No longer can it be suggested by any responsible American, public or private, that the purposes and motives of the United States in Asia are somehow hidden and arcane and that the people of the United States are terribly, terribly "confused."

The position of the Government of the United States has, in President Johnson's address to the Nation by way of his press conference, again and for the umpteenth time been made plain as the noonday sun. We are determined to honor the pledges of three American Presidents to the people of South Vietnam. We seek no melodramatic total "victory." We seek only an end to aggression and invasion and a decent peace decently guaranteed. But these aims we not merely pursue but also demand; and these aims we shall achieve, come what might.

It is not we who will determine how big the war must get. It is the Communist adversary. And every American can only profoundly hope that our little band of fringe Democratic Senators crying "peace" where there is no peace will give that adversary no further cause to believe that this Nation really does not mean what it says when it says that aggression upon South Vietnam has got to stop.

Of all the moonshine so long spread by avowedly "liberal" splinters in the Senate

and House, none has been more persistently spread than the claim that American aims are somehow tricky and that the American public is somehow in the dark. If American aims in fact suffer for credibility, it is from their simplicity and—yes—their honesty and altruism in a world where pseudo-sophisticates are forever on the lookout for the gimmick and the clever phrase to mask candid intentions.

As to the American public, there has not been in all these long months and years of the running Vietnamese crisis the smallest objective evidence of "confusion" as to what this Nation is about in Asia. Every national poll has indicated the exact reverse. Every one has clearly shown that the people know quite well what we are about and that while of course they are not madly gay about it, they fully recognize its necessities.

To this, this columnist can add a personal note. In a 2-week absence from Washington "out in the country" it seemed plain that the only people really "confused" are that minority of breastbeaters in Congress who profess endless "confusion" to avoid facing up to the central truth that we are in Vietnam simply because it is our duty to be there as the leader and guardian of the free world.

There is a time for the fullest debate, even for dog-in-the-manger debate, and for the longest and most pompous of "teach-ins." And these, Heaven knows, we have had in full measure. Then there is a time for a halt to logic-chopping and emotionalized appeals for a "peace" that would mean surrender and a betrayal of our responsibilities on this earth. This time has now arrived. For now, undeniably and beyond further quibbling, the United States of America is at war.

**In the Nation: The Administration's
 GOP Salvage Corps**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, Arthur Krock, the famed New York Times columnist included comments on a very current and pertinent subject. I commend to my colleagues his able presentation of a subject that seriously concerns the national welfare:

**IN THE NATION: THE ADMINISTRATION'S
 GOP SALVAGE CORPS**

(By Arthur Krock)

NEWPORT, R.I., July 31.—The price demanded of President Johnson by organized labor for its intensive support, which materially contributed to his sweep of urban areas in 1964, was the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. But the crowning political irony is that when the President was unable to liquidate his IOU with his Democratic resources in Congress, the deficit was supplied by Republicans.

This was the cream of the jest which designates the Republicans as the party of the opposition, though it failed to attract much notice because it has happened so often before; and because the Republicans who have salvaged key legislative proposals of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations from defeat in overwhelming Democratic Congresses are usually the same individuals. But this Republican rescue act was something very special, considering the basic issues presented, and the general knowledge that repeal of the State right-to-work laws was repayment to organize labor of a promissory note

by the Democratic President for its help in burying the Republican Party in a very deep grave.

TWENTY-ONE GOP VOTES

The House Republicans who covered Mr. Johnson's shortage of Democratic resources in that branch were 21 in number on the final vote, 221 to 203, by which the States may no longer ban labor-management contracts that make union membership a condition of keeping a job. If 10 of these Republicans had voted the other way, the tally would have been 213 to 211 in favor of preserving the State authority to ban or to permit such contracts that is reserved to them in section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. But, though the 21 Republicans are distributed among 8 States, 12 of them represent districts in New York and Pennsylvania. So that these would have been sufficient to make up the Democratic deficit on the repeal proposal, even if they had not been joined by three from Ohio, two from Massachusetts, and one from New Jersey, Wisconsin, Washington, and Maine, respectively. Consequently, the workers in 19 right-to-work States, who now—the Senate concurring—will have to join a union to hold their jobs if their employers and their plant unions so contract, have New York and Pennsylvania Republicans in the House to thank for it.

"GAG RULE" EMPLOYED

All but two of the GOP firemen who saved the Democratic President's child were so dedicated to their mission that they trampled on one of their most loudly professed principles on the way up the ladder. The other 19 opposed the motion of Minority Leader FORD, of Michigan, to recommit the repeal legislation because, under the "gag rule" imposed by the majority leadership, no amendments could even be considered. This "gag rule" was President Kennedy's ground in 1961 for proposing to enlarge the Rules Committee to prevent its use by the bipartisan conservative committee majority at the time. On that ground his proposal was saved from defeat in the Democratic House by the Republican bloc that made possible the repeal of section 14(b) this week through the employment of the identical "gag rule." This inconsistency enabled the Republican bloc, the President and the Democrats who voted for repeal to avoid taking a position on these propositions: to exempt from compulsory unionism the workers whose religion forbade it; to deny the benefit to unions which practice discrimination against Negroes, or use their funds for political purposes. A vote on such amendments was denied the House on the wholly specious, but authorized gag rule holding that they were "nongermane."

Frustrated once again by defections from their own ranks in the effort to establish a political opposition in fact, the minority leaders of the House face the same prospect in the next attempt. This, now being generated by Representative LAMB, of Wisconsin, is to attack the President's position that the costs of the escalation of the war in Vietnam can be financed without any restriction on business as usual, and without any serious reduction of the present and planned program for the welfare State he has named the Great Society. According to LAMB's rough estimate, the total amount of new spending, largely for this purpose, in all the administration's money bills now pending in Congress is \$8.86 billion. He wants to establish a minority party from behind proposals to reduce some of these appropriations and defer the grant of others.

His concept is that this is a prudent fiscal cost for a Government which is progressively escalating its military force in what the President conceded the other day is actual "war," and maintaining meanwhile a huge military establishment as a deterrent to Communist aggression in other parts of the world.

August 2, 1965

A4241

Lamb's argument for his plan is that it is necessary to awaken the American people to the realities of U.S. commitments that he believes the President's assurances of business as usual, and so forth, have submerged in the popular consciousness.

BUDGET REDUCTION TARGETS

The rough total of \$8.86 billion is not all designed for welfare programs of the Great Society but the following, some of which Lamb hopes the congressional minority will unite with him to reduce, are: antipov-
erty, \$1.9 billion; housing, \$1.56 billion; educa-
tion, \$1.876 billion. Also projected is an
appropriation of \$2.7 billion for river and
harbor construction and improvement that
it would be in line with Lamb's reasoning to
reduce.

But the breakdown of the list of the House
Republicans who, in varying but sufficient
numbers, have saved key measures on which
the last two Democratic administrations
gained and retained the party in national
power, leaves small if any prospect that they
will make an exception of Lamb's proposal.
To become a political opposition in the tradi-
tional and effective sense, the Republican
party must first become a cohesive and coura-
geous minority. And that day is not even in
sight.

**Bureau County War on Poverty Goes Well
Beyond Poor**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Bureau
County is a rural area in my 18th Con-
gressional District. It has recently begun
to participate in Project Head Start.
This program was intended for the poor.
An article which appeared in the Peoria
Journal Star, July 30, 1965, however, in-
dicates that OEO has deemed otherwise.
Mr. Shriver has a habit of reading the
law and then doing what he pleases.

The above mentioned article follows:

**BUREAU COUNTY WAR ON POVERTY GOES WELL
BEYOND POOR—KINDERGARTEN FOR ALL**
(By John Bell)

A front of the war on poverty has been ex-
tended beyond the poor in Bureau County.

The U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity is
financing a head start program for kinder-
garten-aged children in that county even
though the children aren't poverty cases.
They are simply boys and girls who live in
school districts which don't operate kinder-
gartens.

Over 150 children are enrolled in nine
classes of the six Head Start centers in
Bureau County. Requirements for admis-
sion provide only that participants must be
ready to enter first grade this fall and live in
a grade school area which has no kinder-
garten.

Head Start is one division in the Federal
Government's war on poverty. It is intended
to help preschool children of the poor to
learn skills and gain experiences that will
help them when they begin school. It is
hoped that the program will help reduce
school dropouts.

Normally the Head Start projects are in-
tended for areas where at least 85 percent
of the families have an average annual in-
come of less than \$3,000.

Joseph Newcomer, Bureau County superin-
tendent of schools and sponsor of this Head
Start program, said he got special permission
from Washington to start it even though

many of the children come from families
with higher incomes than \$3,000. The per-
mission was granted, he said, because Bureau
County has so few kindergartens of its own.

Newcomer reasoned with the Office of Eco-
nomic Opportunity that without the kinder-
garten training these children will receive
in Head Start classes they would have been
"culturally deprived."

He also cited a clause in the application
that denies anyone administering the pro-
gram the power to discriminate on the basis
of race, color, or creed and argued that nei-
ther should administrators be permitted to
discriminate on the basis of a family's in-
come.

Princeton, the county seat, has three pub-
lic kindergartens and therefore has none of
the Child Development Centers, as they are
called by Head Start people. Single classes
are held in the cities of Bureau, Arlington
and Wyanet, with two classes each in Spring
Valley, Manlius, and Ohio.

Director of the program is William Elmen-
dorf, a Bradley graduate who teaches speech
at Hall Township High School in Spring
Valley during the regular school year.

Elmendorf said the program is intended
to help the child go as far as he can with
the skills he learns in the kindergarten-
type classes. The popular conception of
kindergarten as strictly a place to play is
incorrect, he said, and that many children
of the county's head start classes have ac-
quired reading readiness skills, table man-
ners, other abilities on the early first-grade
level.

Each child development center has a
teacher, an assistant teacher who is usually
a college student majoring in primary edu-
cation, and, in most cases, a parental vol-
unteer.

Director Elmendorf pointed out that all
but one of the instructors are certificated
teachers who work in county schools during
the rest of the year. School systems don't
usually sponsor a head start program, said
Newcomer (Peoria's is sponsored by the com-
munity council) but by doing so in Bureau
County he felt he could secure the best pos-
sible instructors.

Elmendorf said the Bureau County pro-
gram has a teacher-student ratio of about
6 to 1, enabling the instructors to spend
more time for individual attention.

The program's staff also includes a school
psychologist, speech therapist, nurse, and
music consultant. The children have been
given sight and hearing tests and medical
examinations. Lunches as required by the
State and bus transportation are provided.
The program is costing the Federal Govern-
ment \$21,230 and the county \$2,425.

Princeton, Depue, Ladd, Spring Valley,
Sheffield, and Buda are the only county grade
schools of the 23 which have kindergartens,
but Elmendorf predicts that other county
grade schools will soon have kindergarten
classes of their own.

"This program has stimulated a lot of
other schools into seeking the possibilities
of getting their own kindergartens, and I
think I can safely say that there'll be more
public kindergartens in this county soon,"
he said.

**International Youth Leadership Training
Course**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, there
is presently in progress at Camp Thun-

derbird, N. Mex., one of the most unique
and important "people to people" pro-
grams in which Americans have ever
been engaged. It is the international
youth leadership training course, in
which 40 young leaders from 15 nations
in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are
being taught the essentials of directing
national youth-work programs.

The international youth leadership
course has been established under the
auspices of Sports International and
Youth for Development, a private, non-
profit organization dedicated to foster-
ing youth development on an interna-
tional level through youth leadership
and sports training programs.

I am proud to note that the founder
and director of Sports International and
Youth for Development is a constituent
of mine in New Jersey's Second District,
Dr. David Dichter, of Atlantic City, a
former athlete and former U.S. Informa-
tion Agency officer. Since its incorpora-
tion in February 1963, Sports Interna-
tional and Youth for Development has
been about the important work of ex-
changing athletic and youth leadership
know-how quietly and without fanfare.

Sports International and Youth for
Development has sponsored annual pro-
grams for foreign track and field ath-
letes who visited the United States to
"learn by doing" at American colleges,
universities, and high schools. These
programs, cosponsored by the host in-
stitutions and the U.S. Department of
State, have proven of great benefit to the
foreign trainees and have resulted in
tangible improvements of the U.S. image
in participating countries, Dr. Dichter
reports. In helping emerging nations
achieve the pride of nationalism with-
out hostility, the programs help make
clear that there is no inbred Western
superiority in athletics—that excellence
is achieved through hard work.

A variety of programs has been
launched by Sports International and
Youth for Development in its relatively
short existence and still other, even more
far reaching, are contemplated. But
the international youth leadership train-
ing course underway in New Mex-
ico is truly worthy of attention, I feel.

While the United States has long rec-
ognized the importance of individual in-
itiative and dynamic leadership in na-
tional life, the international youth
leadership training course is the first
program of its kind to develop self-reli-
ance, initiative, and confidence in for-
eign youth leaders.

Since World War II ended, there has
been a growing interest among newly
independent and developing nations in
utilizing their young people for national
development work. Youth of these na-
tions now play important roles in many
nation-building tasks. Sports Interna-
tional and Youth for Development feels
it is essential that their youth leaders
be able to cope with critical economic
problems they face, such as rural back-
wardness, rapid urban growth, and seri-
ous underemployment. The IYLTC was
devised to provide exactly such prepara-
tion.

"Learn by doing" is the program's
underlying philosophy. Its threefold
program includes classroom instruction

August 2, 1965

on the role and mission of a youth leader; technical instruction on such actual work projects as building roads, laying telephone lines, rearing fish in ponds as a food source, building small dams and schools, and so forth; and instruction on how to utilize the physical challenge of outdoor living in developing confidence.

After completing a 3-month course in New Mexico, the foreign leaders should have mastered many basic construction skills, be competent physical fitness instructors, and possess necessary self-confidence to effectively administer national youth service corps programs. Not only will they be competent organizers, skilled in imparting discipline and esprit de corps, but by their example they will also foster better citizenship in their own young people.

The program's instructors are among the world's most experienced and respected in the youth leadership training field. They include the former director of a Peace Corps training camp in Puerto Rico, a national official of England's Outdoor Activities Council, the Peace Corps director in Guatemala, and a former director of the Agency for International Development's youth conservation program in Turkey. They are joined by experts from the U.S. Forestry Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife, CARE, "Food for Peace," and the Population Council.

Because of its immediate practical nature, this Sports International and Youth for Development program will doubtless enjoy widespread applicability in the nations of the participants. As the 40 youth leaders who are spending the summer in New Mexico put into practice the experience they are acquiring, the International Youth Leadership Training Course will amply demonstrate its effectiveness as a vehicle for harnessing the energy and enthusiasm of youth in Asia, Africa and Latin America for productive, nation-building tasks.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I feel this program is a tribute to the willingness and ability of American citizens to dig in and do something to improve conditions in other parts of the world on a private basis and at a people-to-people level. Dr. Dichter and his colleagues deserve the admiration of all Americans.

Frederic B. Bandstra
Marshalltown Times-Republican Comments on Red China and the Vietnam Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my fellow Members to a perceptive editorial from the July 27, 1965, issue of the Marshalltown Times-Republican of Marshalltown, Iowa.

The editorial, which comments on Red China's relationship to the Vietnam situation, points out that hunger, as well as political ideology, can often be a cause of war.

There are some in the United States, as the editorial notes, who argue that free world nations should not be supplying food to Red China. However, as the editorial also points out, southeast Asia can be a source of food for hungry Chinese.

In this connection, the Times-Republican editorial comments:

In trying to balance a variety of controversial opinions, the United States must plan on stopping Chinese military aggressions into southeast Asia. But at the same time the United States must help the Chinese people to get food.

The editorial discusses matters that merit close study and, under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include it in the Record:

CHINA'S MOST POWERFUL WEAPON IS
PROPAGANDA

As the Vietnam war grows more serious, it is necessary that the American people and their leaders give more consideration to Red China. Many Americans assume that, in fighting the Red guerrillas in South Vietnam, we are actually at war with Red China. It is definite that China support North Vietnam in the present war.

Ambassador Lodge, recently returned to second ditch in South Vietnam, said in a recent interview that China is supplying the weapons and ammunition to the Red guerrillas in South Vietnam and that China originally got these weapons from Russia. This would mean outdated weapons in a sense but the guerrillas use them effectively. Lodge also says that up to now, since the United States has actually been losing in the war, China sees no reason to enter the war actively and is perfectly willing to furnish the weapons while the guerrillas pay a heavy price in the brutal fighting.

This is the best answer available on what China is doing in the Vietnam war and it may be considered official. Actually, the American people know very little about Red China and what it is doing in the war.

China has had a long and unfortunate history of droughts and famines while its population continues to grow by leaps and bounds. This is probably the chief reason why it is a Communist nation today. Reliable reports show that in about seven of the Chinese Provinces a severe drought prevailed from November to April and so the wheat crop in all this area is very short. Even in Manchuria, the only section of China that produces surplus food, drought prevailed until May. Iowa farmers will be interested in the fact that China's soybean crop this year, due to widespread drought, got off to a poor start.

Free nations ship big quantities of wheat to Red China and this year such shipments amount to about 6,200,000 tons. Canada, Australia and Argentina are the chief suppliers of wheat to China and in 4 years China got wheat amounting to half of the annual crop in the United States.

The Sioux City Journal commented recently that free nations seem to be feeding the enemy while we fight them. Some sincere Americans say we ought to sell them wheat as much American wheat does reach China through Canada.

If Americans try to figure out why Red China is backing a war in South Vietnam, there are fertile lands in South Vietnam, in Burma and in most of southeast Asia and China's hordes of hungry people need that food. China takes communism along with it, but in trying to block the spread of com-

munist in southeast Asia, the United States is also blocking the hungry Chinese from a natural outlet to get more food. It is a tough decision for Americans to make.

It is such dilemmas as the millions of starving Chinese which lead some very sincere leaders to urge some friendly approach to Red China. The noted historian, Arnold J. Toynbee, voices such a plea in the current Saturday Evening Post, bearing the title, "We Must Woo Red China."

In trying to balance a variety of controversial opinions, the United States must plan on stopping Chinese military aggressions into southeast Asia. But at the same time the United States must help the Chinese people to get food.

Until China starts sending armies into southeast Asia, or using nuclear weapons in that area, the United States should not try to stop our allies from shipping wheat and other food to China. Shipments of U.S. wheat to China through Canadian traders should not be stopped. One of the Nation's best historians, teaching in Iowa, has a book which purports to show that hunger is the thing that will drive Red nations to start a world war—will surely drive them to do it.

Experts say China can hardly send a big army into southeast Asia but its leaders may try in time. Various reports express a fear of China when it has a supply of nuclear weapons. A recent report shows that China is building submarines that can fire missiles to the U.S. mainland. China is big, tough, and enigmatic and its propaganda against the white race is its most dangerous weapon at the present time.

Salute to Jamaica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today August 2, Jamaica celebrates the third anniversary of her independence. On this occasion, therefore, I wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Alexander Bustamante, the Prime Minister of Jamaica; and to His Excellency Sir Neville Noel Ashenheim, the Jamaican Ambassador to the United States.

Jamaica's emergence from British colonial status into independence made her the first new state in the Western Hemisphere since the beginning of this century and the 14th member of the Commonwealth. Jamaica is a stable multiracial society with a history of democratic institutions. The Jamaican Government's efforts to industrialize were called laudatory in an article which appeared in the New York Times in January of this year.

To overcome the most pressing problems—a lack of investment capital and technical know-how—the Government offers incentives to new enterprises. The incentive law permits duty-free imports of machinery for manufacturing plants and of raw materials for products earmarked for export. One hundred and fifty of the 1,000 plants operating on the island came into being with the help of the incentive laws. The incentive program was aided by Jamaica's stable currency.

the programs for the principal grain crops—wheat, rice, and feed grains. The administration sponsored temporary legislation for the 1964 and 1965 wheat crops, which requires marketing certificates for wheat. For the 1965 crop, millers and other processors must buy certificates valued at 75 cents (5 shillings 4½ pence) a bushel for wheat consumed domestically. Domestic annual consumption of wheat is estimated at about 500 million bushels, thus yielding an estimated amount of \$375 million (£134 million), which in turn is paid to wheatgrowers complying with the program. The 75-cent domestic certificate payment (only 25 cents for export certificates) on top of the \$1.25 price support loan provides producers with a total support of \$2 (14 shillings 3¼ pence) per bushel on wheat consumed domestically. For the 1966 crop, the administration proposes to raise the cost of domestic wheat to \$2.50 a bushel by increasing the price of domestic certificates to \$1.25 but to discontinue the export certificate. For the same 500 million bushels of wheat made into bread, flour, and other products, consumers would be paying \$625 million (£223 million) in processing taxes.

Since millers and baking companies already operate on extremely thin margins, the cost must ultimately be passed on to consumers in higher prices. This is why opponents of the program have characterized the domestic marketing certificates as a bread tax.

In fact the wheat processing tax is similar to an excise tax. Certain excise taxes, including those on furs and jewelry, repealed last month might have yielded as much as \$618 million (£220 million) in fiscal 1966, that is roughly equal to the projected 1966 yield of the wheat tax of \$625 million. Moreover, while these taxes were typically assessed at rates of 10 to 20 percent, the increased wheat tax would amount to roughly 100 percent of the basic farm price, thus almost doubling the price to the miller. The Agricultural Secretary, Orville Freeman, estimated that the new programs for wheat and rice would raise the cost of food 3.6 cents (3¼ pence) a week or \$1.87 (13 shillings, 4½ pence) a year per capita, but he stressed that this should not cause any hardship as over the past 4 years the take-home pay of the average family has sharply increased. However, this hardly justifies price increases in the necessities of life.

A wheat tax undoubtedly strikes hardest at the poor; the lower the family's income the higher is the consumption of wheat products. This was confirmed by the Agricultural Department's survey of household food consumption conducted in 1955, and a similar survey is underway this year. The incongruity of imposing such a regressive tax at a time when the administration is stressing an antipoverty war needs no emphasis. It also contrasts with the President's promise of additional income tax cuts for "those taxpayers who now live in the shadow of poverty." That the aim in increasing the wheat-processing tax is to provide a better income for farmers has been revealed to be misguided in a Saturday Review article by the former Budget Director, Kermit Gordon, who stated that 80 percent of U.S. assistance goes to the 1 million farmers whose average income exceeds \$9,500, while the other 20 percent of assistance is spread thinly among the remaining 2½ million. The farms that produce most of the Nation's food and fiber no longer fall into the lowest one-third of the Nation's income distribution, and though their success is not completely independent of Government commodity programs, these programs are no longer a means of distributing income to the neediest groups in the population. However, the administration in shifting the wheat subsidy from the taxpayer to the consumer makes it possible to show a reduction in Federal budget outlays for com-

modity programs, which in recent years have averaged close to \$4 billion (£1,428 million) a year.

The feed grain program, like the wheat tax originally a temporary measure, is up for a 4-year renewal; its basic aim has been to divert acreage out of key feed grains and though feed grain stocks have been reduced by some 30 million tons in the last 4 years, it has proved to be very expensive. The total expenditure amounts to nearly \$3.7 billion (£1,321 million), equivalent to about \$3.65 (26 shillings) for each bushel reduced. The success of the scheme has further been reduced as prices have continued to be supported at levels attractive enough to spur farmers on to increase yields on the remaining acreage. Consequently, there seems an obvious need for a change in farm programs; the proposed cropland adjustment program can play a vital role in retiring whole farms out of surplus production, provided that the land is not used for other crops; efforts toward providing better training for farm people to speed their successful adjustment in industrial or service occupations are a move in the right direction and need to be expanded. But any new program should work toward gradually bringing about a shift of resources and an adjustment of farm production to permit the Government to reduce sharply its costly intervention in farm markets.

Fe On Zablocki
No Reasonable Alternative in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the criticism which has been leveled at U.S. policy in Vietnam by segments of the Nation's intellectual community, it was refreshing to read an article by the editor of one of the Nation's most prestigious journals, Mr. John Fischer of the Atlantic Monthly.

After giving the Vietnam situation a careful and reasoned assessment, Mr. Fischer has determined that the President's policies are the only reasonable alternative. Unlike some intellectuals, he has not allowed his emotions to sway him into advocating withdrawal from Vietnam.

He rightly points out that the only hope of ultimately "taming" China lies in containing its expansionist tendencies in Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. Fischer for the insights he has brought to the national debate on Vietnam policy, and for his wise support of firmness against Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

Because of my belief that this article will be of interest to my colleagues, I include it at this point as it appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of August 1, 1965:

NO ALTERNATIVE IN VIETNAM: POTENTIAL CRITIC TELLS WHY

(NOTE.—Last week as President Johnson announced large new commitments of U.S. troops to the war on Vietnam, the public debate over the administration's foreign policy continued. A teach-in at the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee and a public hearing conducted by Representative KASTEN-

MEIER, Democrat of Wisconsin, in Madison were among the activities. In the following article, John Fischer, editor in chief of Harper's magazine, tells why he must differ with some of his fellow intellectuals and support the administration policy. The excerpt is reprinted by special permission from the August issue of the magazine, just released.)

I should be listed as a potential critic of the administration's foreign policy. I share a good deal of the uneasiness expressed recently by scores of other writers, artists, and professors, many of them my friends. But perhaps not for the same reasons. I am worried about our involvements in Vietnam, for example, because basic American strategic doctrine ever since Admiral Mahan has held that we should never commit a major land force to combat on the Asiatic mainland. Nobody—certainly not President Johnson—has so far offered a conclusive argument that this doctrine has suddenly become obsolete.

Consequently it seems quite possible that the United States may soon find itself with a large share of its ready divisions bogged down indefinitely—in a corner of Asia remote from the enemy's vital centers, and facing the vastly more numerous manpower of China and its satellites. That could leave us stripped of the power needed to cope with a possible Communist thrust into Europe, the Middle East, India, or Latin America.

Yet I have refused to sign any of the manifestos attacking the administration's policy in Vietnam and Santo Domingo. For the time being, at least, I remain only a potential critic—for reasons indicated below.

In the case of Vietnam, I would feel free to criticize if I could think of a reasonable alternative. None has been suggested, so far as I can discover, by the teach-in professors or the other intellectuals and artists who have been shouting "Hands off Vietnam." A slogan is not a policy; and they have not said what, exactly, they would do if they were sitting behind Johnson's desk.

THE MORAL ISSUE

After all, he didn't get us into the mess. He inherited it, from Eisenhower and Kennedy. If he simply pulled out all American troops, as some of his critics urge, he would not only be betraying an ally (and who would ever trust us then?), but he almost certainly would be turning over all of southeast Asia to the Chinese. They have, remember, always moved south whenever China was ruled by a strong dynasty.

Those who talk about "the moral issue" don't specify what is so moral about extinguishing the nascent democracies of Malaysia and India, or abandoning Thailand and Burma to foreign domination. And those who have any doubt about the intentions of the Chinese Communists toward these targets simply haven't paid attention to what Chairman Mao has been saying these many years—or how he has behaved in conquered Tibet.

The more moderate critics beg Johnson to try harder to negotiate a peaceful settlement—but, again, they don't say how. At this writing the North Vietnam Government and its Chinese allies have rejected every plea for negotiations—from the British, Canadians, French, as well as the White House.

Indeed, I can't see why they should consider negotiation, on any terms whatever, until September at the earliest. Undoubtedly they think they are winning the battle on the ground. If their rainy season offensive does overwhelm the South Vietnamese army and drives out or demolishes the American contingents (as the French were demolished at Dienbienphu) then they will have a political triumph far more resounding than anything they could possibly win by negotiations. So why not try for it?

If the offensive fails, they can always negotiate later—and against opponents wearier and probably more driven by internal disagreements than they are now. (The peace demonstrations in this country probably en-

August 2, 1965

courage the Communists in this intransigence, since they inevitably interpret them as evidence of American weakness and faltering nerve.)

REGIME MAY COLLAPSE

So the best the administration can hope for, apparently, is that the Saigon troops, with our support, can hold until the rains and heavy fighting stop. It may be a near thing. Indeed, it is entirely possible that either the South Vietnam Government or a considerable part of its army or both, may collapse before these words are in print; so at least, I am told by observers with long experience in that country.

But there also is a reasonable chance this will not happen—largely because our bombing of the North Vietnamese bridges, roads, and railways makes it difficult for the Communists to move in and to supply in prolonged combat any considerable number of regular Red divisions.

Without such additional stiffening from the north, the present Vietcong offensive is by no means certain to succeed. It will inflict heavy losses on us and our South Vietnamese allies; but the Vietcong losses are likely to be at least as large. And when a guerrilla force—any guerrilla force—suffers heavy and continuing casualties, without a major victory in return, its morale is likely to get pretty fragile; witness what happened in Poland and Russia during the early years of World War II, and in the unsuccessful Communist guerrilla wars against the Philippines and Malaya.

If, then, the Communists' summer campaign ends in a bloody deadlock, they may at last be willing to open negotiations, secretly and through a third power.

More probably, however, the fighting will simply dwindle away into an unspoken armistice. For, throughout their history, the Marxist states have always been reluctant to negotiate a formal cease fire except under two conditions: (1) When they are convinced that further fighting will cost them more than they can gain and (2) when they are pretty sure that they can win more at the conference table than on the battlefield. Such is the doctrine laid down by Lenin, and followed faithfully by his disciples all the way from Trotsky's 1918 negotiations at Brest Litovsk up to Tito at Trieste, the Chinese at Panmunjom, and the Pathet Lao in Laos.

Today, with the Russians and Chinese in desperate competition for leadership of the world Communist movement, it has become harder than ever for either camp to admit publicly that it is abandoning a "war of national liberation." Consequently, when the Vietcong and their big brothers to the north finally are convinced that they can't win, they probably will just stop fighting—as the Communist guerrillas did in Malaya, in Greece, in the Philippines, and in Venezuela—always with the thought that they may start again on a more auspicious day.

MAO NEEDS ENEMY

Such a lull could come this winter—or in 2 years, or 5. (In Malaya, after all, it took 10 years for the guerrillas to get discouraged.) And any slackening of American resolution or military pressure is likely merely to delay the coming of such a temporary de facto peace.

For genuine peace in Asia does not seem possible so long as the Chinese revolution remains in its virulent, aggressive stage. Chairman Mao urgently needs to get control of the surplus rice production in southeast Asia.

But what he needs more is a foreign enemy. Like other leaders of revolutions in this stage—Napoleon, Hitler, Stalin, even comic little Sukarno—he has found that nothing else will serve to keep his people keyed up, year after year, to the feverish zeal and endless sacrifice which his theology demands.

For the time being, therefore, any attempt to conciliate him is almost certainly hopeless. Even if the United States were to withdraw entirely from the Pacific arena, his need for a major adversary would still remain.

He probably would find it in Russia, India and the other border states are too impotent to look like convincing bugaboos; they are more likely to be cast in the role of quick and easy victims.

Someday the Chinese revolution can be expected to cool off, as the Russian revolution did; and then it may be possible for other countries to deal with China on something like normal diplomatic terms. Meanwhile, for perhaps a generation, the prospect for Asia is continual turmoil and bloodshed.

Nothing America can do will prevent it. But a policy of patient, steadfast containment might hasten its end, helping to bring the Chinese revolution a little earlier into its mature, less bellicose stage. In the case of Russia, such a policy has worked very well indeed—a fact easy to forget in the midst of our current troubles. All it took was 20 years of unremitting diplomatic, economic and military effort.

The lessons of history, therefore, seem to suggest that Johnson's basic course is probably right. So far as I can see, it is the least dangerous and ultimately the least costly of any of the alternatives open to him. And, as always in international affairs, a choice of the lesser evil is about the best anyone can hope for.

But this does not mean that the administration's day-to-day tactics should be exempt from criticism. Surely Johnson has been less than candid in explaining what we are getting into, and why. The contradictory statements flowing out of Washington and Saigon inevitably have stirred up confusion and mistrust, at home and abroad.

Domestic political considerations often seem to weigh too heavily in Johnson's decision—no doubt because his whole life has been drenched in domestic politics, so that he has little visceral understanding of the way foreigners think and feel. * * *

Criticism on matters such as these is the plain duty of the press, the political opposition, and the ordinary citizen who is interested enough to keep reasonably informed. Johnson would do well to listen to them, instead of howling like a cowhand with a centipede in his boot; maybe their comments could help him avoid fumbles in the future.

Another group of critics, however, need not be taken too seriously. It includes many (though not all) of the poets, pediatricians, novelists, painters, and professors who have been making so much noise during the last 4 months. Most of them are deeply humane people who loathe war and wish it would go away. * * * They have every right, of course, to express their views on matters of universal concern. But their professional eminence—Robert Lowell's in poetry, Mark Rothko's in painting, Dr. Spock's in medicine—does not automatically endow them with wisdom about foreign policy. Here their opinions are worth just about as much as Dean Rusk's views on poetry or Robert McNamara's on raising babies—which are also matters of universal concern.

Personally I am inclined to give more weight to the opinion of another rebellious intellectual who in addition to his scholarly accomplishments, has considerable experience in statecraft. He is Dr. C. Rajagopalachari, a leader in India's struggle for independence, a companion of Gandhi, a pioneer in civil disobedience, and an apostle of peace. He also served after independence as governor general of India. In a letter to the New York Times of June 6, he spoke to "the best brains of America" about their "criticism and ridicule" of the President's policy in Vietnam.

"There is not the slightest doubt," he wrote, "that if America withdraws and leaves southeast Asia to itself, Communist China will advance and seize the continent. All the people of Asia will soon be intimidated to pay homage to the Communist Parties in each of the regions of Asia. * * * There is no hope for freedom of thought in Asia if the hegemony, if not the empire, of China, is established."

Justice Goldberg to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, by appointing Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, President Johnson has reaffirmed our basic commitment to that world body. Justice Goldberg is one of America's most talented public servants, a negotiator of unrivaled skill, and a seasoned and able leader of men. The Los Angeles Times, on July 21, expressed its editorial support for the President's outstanding nomination and, under unanimous consent, I include that editorial in the RECORD:

JUSTICE GOLDBERG TO THE U.N.

The voice that speaks for the United States in the forum of the United Nations must be articulate, persuasive, emphatic and reasoned. Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg, President Johnson's choice to succeed Adlai Stevenson as U.N. Ambassador, has such a voice.

Mr. Johnson's selection was, of course, a surprise. Speculation on a new Ambassador had naturally centered on persons with experience in foreign affairs and international diplomacy. Justice Goldberg's background, as lawyer, union counsel, Secretary of Labor, and High Court judge, touched but little in these areas. Yet his other outstanding qualifications would seem to far outbalance whatever lack of formal expertise he may have in the arena of world politics.

America's Ambassador to the United Nations, like the Ambassadors of all other countries, is not a policymaker. Policy is formed in the White House and State Department, and the task of the chief U.S. representative is to carry out these decisions, to serve as the spokesman and, if need be, the defender of official U.S. interests.

Justice Goldberg should be able to fulfill this need admirably. He is, above all else, an advocate, with great talents for presenting, arguing and upholding a case. His fine legal mind and debating skills, sharpened by years of labor negotiating, will be put to good use in the give-and-take argumentation of the Security Council, where the U.S. Ambassador is most on public display.

In less open U.N. forums, in the private meetings which are essential to the conduct of affairs, Justice Goldberg can also be expected to carry his own. Security Council proceedings are often adversary-type procedures, where an articulate toughness is the first need. But in the quiet, informal sessions where so much of the business of the world organization is transacted, debate must give way to a reasoned search for conciliation. The Ambassador-designate has qualities which suit him for both kinds of encounter.

It is probably not easy for Justice Goldberg to give up his place on the High Bench, a position that had been his lifetime ambition. In becoming what he called our Nation's advocate of peace in the council of nations he faces immense new challenges. He carries to these challenges not only the great prestige of his Supreme Court office, but innate talents that give every promise of serving him—and this Republic—well in the years ahead.

Project Head Start Going Wonderfully

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon B. Johnson openly declared war on poverty in America and recommended to Congress broad programs to cope with pockets of deprivation which exist throughout our society today.

Congress acted with all due speed and detailed deliberation to authorize steps which would assist the development of economic opportunity in America. One of the programs which has been fostered by this speedy attack on poverty is Project Head Start. I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from July 15 issue of the Times-Star of Alameda, Calif., in my congressional district, which outlines how well the head start program is going in Alameda:

PROJECT HEAD START GOING WONDERFULLY

Project Head Start, designed to prepare preschool-age children to meet the demands soon to be placed upon them, is going wonderfully, according to Clarence Kline, Alameda's project director.

Head start, one of the programs sponsored nationally by the Office of Economic Opportunity, is open to children who will enter kindergarten or first grade in the fall. Nationally, the program is aimed at primarily the less wealthy elements of the individual communities in which it exists.

Thus far, 42 youngsters have been enrolled in the program. Total capacity at the two centers, located at Mastick and John Muir Schools, is 50 children. When the program began July 5, 37 children were enrolled. Kline said that family visitations are being made now, and "we have high hopes of fulfilling the capacity by the end of the third week."

Kline reported that dozens of people, including teenagers as well as older people, have offered their aid to the program. In addition, there are 4 teachers (ultimately to allow for 1 teacher for each 12 to 13 students) working with the youth. Three are at the Mastick Center and one is at John Muir.

Daily activities include everything from playing to listening to stories, working with arts and crafts, listening to music, and taking care of plants. The children from the Mastick group went to Ben Reimer's nursery yesterday and after a tour of the grounds, were each given an individual plant to care for.

Noting that "we still have dates available and we will remain very flexible in our program so we may meet the needs of the children and opportunities available," Kline stressed the importance of community participation in the program. For instance, he said that police and firemen will be re-

quested to come speak to the children at a future date.

"Maybe the people assume the school does it all, or they must be approached first," he said, "but actually we would be very pleased to have them volunteer. Any one of a number of groups has a great deal to offer these children."

Doctor and dentist appointments have also been planned for the children and arrangements have been made for additional appointments, if they prove necessary.

Furthermore, nutrition programs are part of the daily schedule, allowing children to have not only milk, juice, and cookies, but other foods which many of them have never seen or tasted before as well.

Expressing pleasure with the parent participation in the program, Kline commented that "90 percent of the parents are responding well." Meetings with the parents are held on a regular basis, giving them an opportunity to discuss child development, nutrition, the progress their children are making, and other pertinent topics.

Memorial Service for Adlai E. Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the funeral services for the late Governor Adlai E. Stevenson on July 19, 1965 which were held at the Unitarian Church of Bloomington, Ill., were simple, eloquent and beautiful in closing the last chapter of his book of life. I append them hereto for all members to read:

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON, JULY 19, 1965 AT THE UNITARIAN CHURCH, BLOOMINGTON, ILL.

(Conducted by Robert Reed, Minister)

CALL TO WORSHIP

"In the time of trouble the Lord shall hide me in His pavilion * * * He shall set me up upon a rock * * * I had fainted unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living. Wait on the Lord; be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thine heart." (Verses from Psalm 27, Mr. Stevenson's favorite.)

Prayer: God of all, transforming spirit ever rising in the midst of life and in the hearts of men, persuading us, consoling us, and binding us to one another, our days are black with sorrow. Our father, brother, friend, trusted leader, kindred spirit, Adlai E. Stevenson, is dead. His voice is silent. And more than that for those assembled here he looks at us, he touches us, he walks with us no more. His wisdom and his wit, his deep concern for everyone, great and small, his design to serve the building of a world of freedom, peace, and justice—all of these are with us still. The well is full. He left it so. But the water is strangely altered. Halted, humbled by this loss, a diverse people, bringing many faiths that we would hold as one, we turn to thee that we may accept his dying, be freed from bondage to despair, and see again the glory which makes life sweet among the living even with their dead. Amen.

SECOND READINGS

Here, on the prairies of Illinois and the Middle West, we can see a long way in all directions. We look to east, to west, to north and south. Our commerce, our ideas, come and go in all directions. Here there are no

barriers, no defenses, to ideas and aspirations. We want none; we want no shackles on the mind or the spirit, no rigid patterns of thought, no iron conformity. We want only the faith and conviction that triumph in free and fair contests. (From welcoming address, July 21, 1952).

I have Bloomington to thank for the most important lesson I have learned * * * that in quiet places, reason abounds * * * that in quiet people, there is vision and purpose * * * that many things are revealed to the humble which are hidden from the great. (From the courthouse square in Bloomington, Ill., on the evening of September 15, 1948.)

I think that one of our most important tasks * * * is to convince ourselves and others—that there is nothing to fear in difference; that difference, in fact, is one of the healthiest and most invigorating characteristics without which life would become lifeless. Here lies the power of the liberal way; not in making the whole world * * * (adopt our ways), but in helping ourselves and others to see some of the possibilities inherent in viewpoints other than one's own: in encouraging the free exchange of ideas; in welcoming fresh approaches to the problems of life; in urging the fullest, most vigorous use of critical self-examination. (From a fairly recently letter, last year or so, to Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER.)

We travel together, passengers on a little spaceships, dependent upon its vulnerable reserves of air and solid; all committed for our safety to its security and peace; preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and I will say the love we give our fragile craft. We cannot maintain it—half fortunate, half miserable, half confident, half despairing, half slave—to the ancient enemies of man—half free in a liberation of resources undreamed of until this day. No craft, no crew can travel safely with such vast contradictions. On their resolution depends the survival of us all. (From Adlai Stevenson's final speech.)

PRAYER

Above the broad prairies rose the fragile vessel of a human life striving to realize the fullness of itself. Day by day his greatness grew from small beginnings hardly recognized by those close by steadily to become a giant among men everywhere. He stood among us as a beacon light unwavering for kindly relations among men, for words that took men seriously and enabled them to see more clearly, for gentle humor yielding a better perspective on things, for reason, conscience, and self-criticism, for personal integrity, for freedom and for justice, and for steadfast service to peace among men.

Shall all of this be lost with the sudden coming of his death? Dare we not instead believe that one so much involved in life as our beloved has long since won his place in the enduring heart of being. Dare we not believe indeed that his being lies within us still as a gift received by us from him, as surely as the grief we feel today because he has become so deeply a part of us. Dare we not believe that even such as we may learn more greatly to express the qualities that we have found so dear in him. Dare we not believe that the greatness of this man like the glory of the illustrious sons of man before him will continue to lead us on. O Thou Lord of Being-Without-End made known to us supremely through one another, teach us as he has taught that human life is sweet and purposeful even though it shall be lost, show us that we, too, may be confident of the ways of goodness if only we will give ourselves to doing good, and encourage us to serve more fully in ourselves the virtues disclosed in him. Amen.

CLOSING READINGS

May each of us live as a binder together of those who are divided, an encourager of

August 2, 1965

those who are friends, a peacemaker, a lover of peace, impassioned for peace, a speaker of words that make for peace. (From traditional Buddhist writings.)

The Lord bless you and keep you.

The Lord deal kindly and graciously with you.

The Lord bestow his favor upon you and grant you peace. (From 1962 Jewish Publication Society of America translation of "The Torah.")

Amen.

A TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

(By Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, President, Unitarian Universalist Association)

The very presence of this company speaks more eloquently and more tenderly than anything that we can say or sing. But here in the community and the church of his childhood and of lifelong associations, we pay to Governor Stevenson our most intimate and final tribute, in a time of lasting bereavement for all mankind.

Many of those who have loved him the longest and most dearly are with us, yet the larger company at Washington's National Cathedral bowed as reverently in his honor; and statesmen and the common people alike, the world around have taken him to their hearts, and will mold his memory into their own image of the best life and prophecy of America in the 20th century.

Adlai Stevenson was destined by his heritage and his own nature for public service. And although in moments he shrank from that role, he also thrived upon it. It was at once a bitter cup that he had to drink, and the elixir of life that lifted him to the fulfillment of his own powers. He may not have thought that he had accomplished enough, for there were disappointments, public and private, and yet unmistakably he was called to greatness; and the God that shines in the firmament of the heavens was radiant in his person and resonant in his voice. Neither ancient Israel nor modern New York could produce a more articulate spokesman for justice and the right. If Winston Churchill could turn a phrase as well, it was not to liquidate the empire, but to keep the past upon her throne, whereas Governor Stevenson undertook the tougher task primarily of persuading a nation to minimize its sovereignty and to merge its hopes and fears with those of other nations. In his own words his attempt was "to defrost a segment of the opaque window through which we see others and others see us," and thereby to increase understanding and fraternity among men.

He added very recently that change is not the great enemy of man, but violence is that enemy. If political success is to raise the level of the national debate and of the world's dialog; to make truly qualified people feel more at home in public life, and to influence one's country and mankind for good, then he achieved success emphatically and dramatically. We shall remember his combination of greatness and goodness.

We salute him for his modesty and his ambition, for his ability and his affability, for his wisdom and his wit, and for his failures and his successes. His mind was extraordinarily free from prejudice, and subservient to the truth. If at times he seemed to take longer to make decisions, it was because he sought the moral context for the workable answer.

He was a philosopher and a politician. All men counted with him, but none too much. He was an American, but he died in England. He was a Democrat, but his family newspaper, of which he was a part owner, is Republican. He was a Unitarian, but in our capitol his flag-draped casket lay fittingly before an ecumenical Episcopal altar. In the climax of his career he was an Ambassador to the United Nations, with strong convictions of his own, and with an unflinching

fidelity to his country and his President. If there ever seemed to be contradictions in his life, Emerson's explanation is applicable, "to be great is to be misunderstood." He was not just an American or only a Democrat, or exclusively a Unitarian or solely an Ambassador. He was also always the universal citizen. His patriotism was intense, but it had no bounds. His politics were both purposeful and personal. And the cardinal principles of his religion were freedom and human dignity.

My friend and colleague Robert Richardson reminds me that their great-grandfather Jesse Fell, would be very proud to have us say that the Governor was truly Lincolnesque in his idealism, his integrity, his compassion, and his humor, as well as in his love of the State of Illinois. He was a devoted son, and brother, and father. He was a loyal friend. And he was a servant to all the children of men. In that distant day when nobody rattles a saber and nobody drags a chain, his name will shine with an ever-increasing luster.

He understood not only democracy and communism, but likewise the moving forms and shadows of a world revolution. He was not cowed by complexity, but kept his eye on the goals that he knew to be worth every effort that could be bent in their direction. He believed in a better world that we ourselves can and must create here and now.

A decade ago, with his friend Albert Schweitzer and Prime Minister Nehru, he was a prophetic advocate of a nuclear test ban treaty. How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that publisheth peace. G. K. Chesterton once said that if we only had more visionaries among our statesmen, we might get something really practical done. Adlai Stevenson was that kind of a statesman.

Thought there was a poignancy in his life that matched the hungers of his heart and the sensitiveness of his being, he had a faith that was greater than any problem or peril or defeat. And he was able to say with Esdras "Great is the truth and mighty above all things."

"The memorial of virtue is immortal because it is known with God and with men. When it is present, men take example at it, and when it is gone, they desire it. It wear-eth a crown and triumpheth forever, having gotten the victory, striving for undefiled rewards."

Fe (On) Cohelan
Realism and Prudence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in his thoughtful column of July 30, the distinguished analyst and commentator, Walter Lippmann, has evaluated the meaning and significance of President Johnson's statement to the American people of last Wednesday.

Mr. Lippmann has pointed out that the President has decided, for the time being at least, to fight a limited war in Vietnam, to reject serious escalation, and to increase our diplomatic efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement. He has gone on to suggest that these decisions are "realistic and as a result the American position is strengthened and improved."

As I have stated repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, I believe our proper policy in Vietnam is a limited war designed to

deter aggression and so-called wars of national liberation directed and supported externally; persistent efforts to achieve international negotiations based on the Geneva accords; and self-determination for the people of South Vietnam under United Nations' guarantees. In the difficult months which lie ahead I hope that these goals, which are consistent with those outlined by Mr. Lippmann, can be actively and aggressively pursued.

I include Mr. Lippmann's analysis for our colleagues' information:

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 1965]

REALISM AND PRUDENCE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The decisions taken by the President as the result of the review of the situation in Vietnam are, it seems to me, realistic, and as a result, the American position is strengthened and improved. The crucial issue which he had to resolve was what this country should do in view of the fact that the South Vietnamese Government has lost to the Vietcong the control of virtually all the highways and most of the villages and territory of South Vietnam. Should the United States volunteer to fight the war which Saigon has so very nearly lost, substituting American troops for the Vietnamese troops, taking military command of all the fighting forces and of the government in Saigon? Or should the United States defend its presence in South Vietnam for the purpose of negotiating a political settlement?

The difference between these two strategies is all the difference between, on the one hand, an unlimited and illimitable war that could escalate into total war, and, on the other hand, a limited war, as the President calls it a "measured" war, which is clearly within American military power, demands no exorbitant sacrifice, and keeps the struggle within the possibility of diplomatic negotiations. The President on Wednesday announced, if I understand him correctly, his choice between these two strategies. Although he repeated the grand formulas of a great war, in fact his decision as of now is to fight a limited war. The size of the callup is in accord with this decision: the additional troops are sufficient, or can be made sufficient, for a limited and defensive strategy. They would be absurdly inadequate if our objectives were the reconquest of South Vietnam. Instead of 125,000 men, the troops needed would, according to the usual formula of 10 to 1 for guerrilla war, mean more nearly a million.

There is additional evidence from the official disclosures on Wednesday that the President has decided against a serious escalation of the war in North Vietnam. He has been under pressure to send the bombers into the heart of North Vietnam, into the area of Hanoi and Haiphong, where are the industries and the population centers of the country. While it is never wise for a commander to say what he will not do, there is considerable evidence that the administration has decided not to bomb the population centers, and to avoid putting Hanoi in the position where, having nothing to lose in the north, it uses its formidable army to invade South Vietnam.

Moreover, high U.S. Government officials have let it be known that we do not intend to comb the countryside to eliminate the Vietcong from the villages, but rather to confine ourselves to conventional military action.

Along with the decision to keep the war limited, the President has launched a strong diplomatic campaign for a negotiated peace. He has in the past proposed, or hinted at, most, perhaps all, of the elements of his campaign. But the combination he described on Wednesday is new and impressive.

In calling upon the United Nations and on all member governments, severally or jointly, to bring the fighting to an end, he has, for the first time I think, given the mediators something concrete to talk about with Hanoi.

The President has agreed that the principles of the 1954 agreements, which are the declared war aims of Hanoi, are an acceptable basis of negotiation, and that we are prepared in South Vietnam, or in all Vietnam, to accept elections supervised by the U.N. This is contrary to the position taken by Secretary Dulles 10 years ago, and the President's willingness to return to "the purpose of the 1954 agreements" opens the door wide in principle to a negotiated settlement.

Probably, Hanoi will still refuse to negotiate. For the Vietcong and Hanoi are within sight of a military victory, not over the United States but over the Saigon Government, and it is by no means certain that General Westmoreland with his reinforcements can prevent that. But even if he cannot prevent it, the strategy adopted by the President will leave the U.S. Army invincible in Vietnam, with the United States exercising an influence which cannot be ignored in the eventual settlement.

see other side

The Warsaw Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Members of this body and all Americans should be reminded that August 1, designated Warsaw Uprising Day, marks the 21st anniversary of the historic act of Polish patriots to liberate their capital, the city of Warsaw from its cruel and inhuman Nazi occupiers.

In President Lyndon B. Johnson's impressive proclamation of last year, designating August 1 as Warsaw Uprising Day, the President acted on the premise that the American people regard the actions of the Polish patriots in the Warsaw uprising as a great manifestation of bravery and devotion to home and country. He urged that this historic effort should serve to inspire people everywhere to rededicate themselves to the cause of freedom and justice.

Mr. Speaker, the words of our President are just as meaningful a year later as they were when proclaimed. The importance of being reminded of the valiant and heroic efforts of a captive nation to overthrow its oppressors is vital to all of us living in the free world today.

Today the Nazi occupiers are but a recorded historic failure, but the memory of their cruelty, their arrogance and their lack of interest in humanity is as vivid as it was a score of years ago. Unfortunately the patriots of Poland who survived the punishments meted out by the Nazis to the Polish people, whether actually participating in the uprising or not, were not to enjoy freedom when the Nazi forces were finally subdued.

All too soon a new and sinister force took over the destiny of Poland and subjected its freedom-loving people to a life of privation and servitude under Com-

munist leadership as bad as that of the Nazis.

Today the Polish people are still denied the right of self-determination. Today as in 1944 they are subject to the whims of an alien master. Today their lives are still regulated and nonconformity assures a swift and dire punishment.

So, Mr. Speaker, on this day 21 years after one of the greatest displays of a people's courage ever recorded anywhere on the pages of history, we must remind ourselves that the Polish people like all the people behind the curtains and the wall erected by Communist dictatorship are still held captive. They are held in bondage by those whose power can only be maintained as long as there are no free elections and no toleration of the people's voice and will.

On this day we pray that soon the conditions of the world may be such that those who love freedom may be able to assert themselves to the extent that domination of the weak by stronger, foreign powers will end and that all men may choose their own leaders, pursue their own choice of occupation, worship how and as they please, and be assured of living in peace and security. This goal to the pessimist is an impossibility; to the optimist a golden era; but to us as Americans it is but the practical attainment by the people of the world of but a fraction of what we in America have long enjoyed. May this anniversary remind us of our obligations as Americans and help us to rededicate ourselves to the attainment, worldwide, of liberty and justice for all.

Greater Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an announcement regarding a new national educational program to reduce general aviation accidents and promote greater air safety. As many Members of Congress know, general aviation includes private flying, business aviation of the type being employed by increasing numbers of U.S. corporations, crop dusting, and as a matter of fact all other types of flying being done in the Nation except that performed by the military services and the airlines. It is growing by leaps and bounds, both in hours flown and numbers of private and corporate aircraft involved.

Any sound program to promote greater safety in this segment of aviation and bring it up to the level of the U.S. commercial air carriers which are the safest in the world, deserves support and as an Air Force veteran of World War II, I salute all efforts such as this latest one to add to the fine work already being done by Government agencies, aircraft manufacturers and pilots, groups and

organizations, and many others concerned with safety.

The Flight Safety Foundation, with headquarters in New York City, will carry out the new educational program on a national scale with the full backing of the Federal Aviation Agency. The Foundation is a nonprofit corporation, headed by a distinguished retired officer, Maj. Gen. Joseph D. Caldara, who has held the post of Director of Air Safety Research for the Air Force. I know personally one of its vice presidents, Ansel E. Talbert, who made a fine record as an editor and foreign correspondent in many parts of the world before he took up his present work; his family and ancestors have lived in my neck of the woods since before the Revolutionary War; and during World War II he was promoted from private to lieutenant colonel.

I believe that Members of the House of Representatives will be interested in following developments in this national safety educational program, which will affect many of their constituents as well as corporations located in their district.

FLIGHT SAFETY FOUNDATION UNDERTAKES NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM TO REDUCE GENERAL AVIATION ACCIDENTS

The Flight Safety Foundation will undertake an extensive new national educational program with the backing of the Federal Aviation Agency aimed specifically at reducing accidents in general aviation, Maj. Gen. Joseph D. Caldara, U.S. Air Force retired, president of the foundation, announced yesterday.

General aviation is the rapidly growing segment of the aviation community comprising all flying other than airline and military. It includes both private flying and business aviation, and such specialized fields as crop dusting.

General Caldara disclosed that the prime objective of the foundation's program would be to persuade pilots and others in general aviation to upgrade their flight proficiency and knowledge as the chief means of reducing the number of aircraft accidents.

He noted that the immense value, safety-wise, of a professional approach had been demonstrated beyond any possible doubt by the excellent safety record attained by corporations employing well-trained professional pilots, and stressing good maintenance at all times. This was comparable to the operational safety level of the U.S. airlines, he said.

General Caldara, who on March 1, 1964, became president of the Flight Safety Foundation, a completely independent, nonprofit, nongovernment organization—supported by more than 300 corporations located in the United States and many other nations—gave details of the new educational program to representatives of the aviation and daily press at special meetings held last week at the Wings Club (Hotel Biltmore, 43d and Madison in New York City) and at the National Press Club in Washington.

General Caldara reported that a mail campaign comprising a series of letters explaining objectives and details of the general aviation safety program would be employed at once to reach approximately 11,500 different aviation organizations and key personnel including State aviation departments, operators of fixed bases, and by private and business pilots, manufacturers and firms doing aircraft modification, flying clubs, airport managers, flying farmers, flying physicians, flying lawyers, and many others.

A "FSF flight safety kit," he disclosed, will be sent on a monthly basis to the same group. This will include a flight safety education cartoon, special aircraft accident sum-

mary and analysis reports, safety bulletins, and other items having a bearing on aircraft accident prevention.

The foundation, according to General Caldara, plans to provide and supervise the operation of at least 100 visual programming trainers. These electronic pushbutton devices allow a pilot to test and update his safety knowledge on a true or false question-and-answer basis, through films which will be changed at frequent intervals.

The Flight Safety Foundation, General Caldara revealed, will put out these devices on loan to facilities throughout the continental United States used by general aviation people. The devices will be in operation at least 8 hours a day.

The Flight Safety Foundation, according to General Caldara, will develop and conduct at least one flight safety rally of 3 days duration during the next year in a convenient location for pilots and other general aviation people in each of the following areas: Eastern region, New York City area; Richmond, Va., area. Central region, Wichita, Kans., area and Omaha, Nebr., area. Southwest region, Dallas, Tex., area and Oklahoma City, Okla., area. Western region, Los Angeles and San Francisco areas and Portland, Oreg.-Seattle, Wash., area. It plans to conduct special conferences on request and take part in aviation meetings sponsored by manufacturers, aircraft modification firms, State aviation officials and others.

There will be periodic safety presentations at each of the five FAA regional headquarters and the special Flight Safety Foundation staff working full time on the general aviation educational program will attend FAA meetings on safety as required. On a more personalized basis the general aviation safety project staff will provide a hot line advisory service for answering questions sent in by telephone, telegram, or airmail letter by participants in the program and it will conduct numerous field visits and make personal contacts with organizations and operators participating.

The full-time staff will be headed by Allen C. Miner, vice president, operations of FSF and a deputy; and will include research analysts, information and education specialists and an operation safety survey team.

FAA LAUNCHES SAFETY PROGRAM TO REDUCE GENERAL AVIATION ACCIDENTS

A far-reaching safety campaign to reduce general aviation aircraft accidents was announced yesterday by the Federal Aviation Agency following the award of a \$268,635 contract to the Flight Safety Foundation, Inc., to launch Project GAPE—general aviation pilot education.

Object of the year-long project as stated by FAA will be to "develop and apply an educational program which will persuade the general aviation segment of the aviation community to upgrade its flight proficiency and knowledge in order to reduce the number of aircraft accidents."

The program, with the support of the general aviation industry, various general aviation organizations, the Civil Aeronautics Board and others, will supplement FAA's own extensive and continuing efforts in safety education.

General aviation is the largest segment of the aviation community. It includes all aviation except military and airline and is comprised of more than 88,000 active aircraft, and over 300,000 pilots.

Project GAPE will be directed to the solution of what has been the main problem behind most general aviation accidents in recent years—lack of pilot proficiency and knowledge of safe flight procedures and practices. These were the chief reasons for almost 80 percent of the slightly more than 5,000 general aviation accidents in 1964.

Scheduled to be kicked off immediately with reporting to FAA to begin October 1, the program will cover every facet of general aviation operations.

Some 11,500 different organizations and aviation industry personnel will be contacted and their cooperation requested in supporting a nationwide program of accident prevention through a vigorous publicity campaign, displays, meetings, seminars, special conferences, personal contacts, and similar educational activities.

A large variety of safety educational and promotional kits will be developed and sent to program participants on a regular monthly basis. The kits will consist of pilot news bulletins, accident summaries, safety education cartoons, "cause and cure" bulletins, posters, special accident reports, mechanics bulletins, and other safety material.

At least 100 film projectors will be rotated among various airports showing filmstrips on safety. These will be in operation 8 to 12 hours a day for a period of several weeks at general aviation activity airports.

Flight safety surveys will be offered general aviation operators on their flight and maintenance operations. Three-day safety seminars will be conducted at key cities. Special conferences and meetings will be held with regional FAA officials, airplane and equipment manufacturers, State aviation officials, and others. Semiannual safety rallies for the flying public will be conducted on an area basis.

Flight Safety Foundation will furnish field personnel to help organize local programs and establish personal contact with program participants. FSF also will provide a hot line advisory service to answer questions from program participants in the field.

Quarterly progress reports will be submitted to FAA throughout the course of the program with a final summary report late in 1968.

Je. On. Fassel
Miami Newspapers Endorse President's
Position in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, with good cause, the people of southern Florida, just as all Americans, are expressing great concern about the Nation's position and efforts in Vietnam. The United States has had a deep interest in the sovereignty of South Vietnam for more than a decade. Our nonmilitary economic aid in this time amounted to some \$2.8 billion, and we have at the same time been involved in a military effort to one degree or another. Only in recent months, however, has this turmoil been so grave as to capture the attention and anxiety of all Americans. With President Johnson's message last week, it has become common knowledge that the Communist aggression in South Vietnam constitutes the United States most crucial problem on the international scene.

Editorial reaction to the President's message is contained in two of Florida's finest newspapers, the Miami Herald and the Miami News. Endorsing the President's decision both to build up our military involvement and simultaneously to plea for peaceful settlement at the con-

ference table, these two editorials represent, I am confident, the consensus of the citizens of Florida's Fourth District and the United States.

For their lucid articulation of the position I share with so many Americans, I would like to bring to each Member's attention these two articles which appeared in the July 29, 1965, editions of the Miami News and the Miami Herald:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, July 29, 1965]

WE'RE COMMITTED—PERIOD

Only in its moderation was President Johnson's announcement on Vietnam a surprise for the Nation.

In the past week Mr. Johnson has consulted scores and even hundreds of Congressmen, military advisers, aids and private citizens in the startling absence of national debate.

The people have been prepared for prodigies of national effort in southeast Asia. Yet when the President spoke from this product of decision-by-consultation he asked only for a doubling of the draft calls and the dispatch of some 50,000 more troops to Vietnam.

Thus, the effort will be partial and the physical commitment piecemeal—if more pacific schemes fail. For once, however, the purpose is clear. The President's "carefully measured" steps were described in carefully measured words which will permit little twisting abroad. He said:

"Our power is a vital shield (against Asian communism). If we are driven from the field in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in our promise or protection. In each land the forces of independence would be weakened. And an Asia so threatened by Communist domination would imperil the security of the United States itself."

This is the premise of U.S. policy in southeast Asia. Thoughtful men may quarrel with it successfully, but the commitment it implies is now irrevocable.

In the name of the United States its President has proclaimed no surrender and no retreat. The escalation is on. It can be lowered or halted only by surrender or sincere negotiation on the other side.

To this end the President left a door open at the United Nations.

If the United States has been remiss in anything, it can be faulted historically for failing to go to the forum of nations before this time.

History may not show, however, that the U.N. is feeble and hamstrung by the Soviet veto. Thus in naked reality there has had to be recourse to other methods of determining a political issue. We hope that Ambassador Goldberg will move the world organization. But, in short, we doubt it.

There can be little doubt on the other hand of general public acceptance of Mr. Johnson's charge to the Nation.

He was clear, precise, forthright, humble, and convincing. He did not bluster, nor did he plead. He laid it on the line. It was, we think, the best performance of his political lifetime.

But it was also, in southeast Asia, a grim demarcation of the point of no return.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, July 29, 1965]
ASKS U.N. AID: JOHNSON HOPES FOR PEACE,
GIRDS FOR WAR

President Johnson's determination that democracy will triumph in the steaming jungles of southeast Asia is exceeded only by his patient efforts to secure peace at the conference table.

Before he announced his "agonizing and painful duty" to double the size of American military forces in Vietnam, the President

noted in somber tones that "15 efforts have been made to start discussions with the Communists"—all without response.

"But we will persist," he declared, a vow that he emphasized in his initial assignment to Arthur Goldberg, the new U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Mr. Johnson sent a special message yesterday to U Thant, the U.N. Secretary General, urging that "all the resources, energy, and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and bring peace in Vietnam."

Mr. Johnson's statement to the Nation was not totally unexpected although some observers thought he might call up the National Guard along with the Reserves. The decision to double the draft calls from 17,000 young men to 35,000 each month will have a great and immediate effect in homes across the land. But in a time of war this is a necessary evil.

The American public will applaud the President for his firm stand in the face of Communist tyranny and aggression. Certainly we are faced with doing more and giving more than we have ever done before in the preceding 11 years. This is the only course possible today.

Report From Washington: Speculates on Maneuvering To Get Abe Fortas on High Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is rightful concern across the country over the obviously political and personal motivation of the President in the appointment of his attorney and confidant Abe Fortas to the Supreme Court. Mr. Walter Trohan, the distinguished chief of the Chicago Tribune Washington bureau, in his report from Washington of Saturday, July 31, discusses some questionable aspects of the Fortas appointment:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON: SPECULATES ON MANEUVERING TO GET ABE FORTAS ON HIGH COURT

(By Walter Trohan, chief of Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, July 30.—A most interesting point for speculation has been raised by the appointment of Abe Fortas, Washington influence lawyer, White House adviser, Great Society news manager, and personal attorney to President Johnson, to succeed Arthur Goldberg in the U.S. Supreme Court. The question is: Did Fortas from his place behind the throne counsel the appointment of Goldberg as Ambassador to United Nations in order to make room for himself on the High Court?

Perhaps we will never know for certain, but Fortas' operations in the past would indicate that there is a distinct possibility he did get the President to have Goldberg move over on the bench of the hierarchy of the Great Society. There is no question but that Fortas was consulted on the successor to Adlai E. Stevenson and on the successor to Goldberg.

It may be, as friends of Fortas insist, that he didn't want the appointment, but he took it. He didn't want an appointment to the

Cabinet and turned that down without difficulty. Evidently he was aiming higher.

This is the first time in American history that a President appointed a personal attorney to the High Court. Fortas knows many Johnson secrets, including the growth of the family TV-radio fortune, the real facts of the Bobby Baker influence case, and the inside of the unfortunate and sordid sex scandal involving the top White House aid, Walter Jenkins, on the eve of the presidential election.

PROVES HE'S ADEPT NEWS MANAGER

Fortas represented Baker until Mr. Johnson became President. He then withdrew as counsel for Baker, making himself the more palatable for a high appointment, which has now come to him. In the Jenkins case, Fortas proved himself among the most adept of news managers. He persuaded or induced two Washington newspapers not to print a line on the scandal. He was working on the third when the story was disclosed by a news service.

The Fortas affinity for Communist associates is well known. He served in the Department of Agriculture in the early 1930's where his best friends were members of one or another of the Communist cells which were fermenting under the tender care of Henry Wallace, who later ran for President on a third party ticket dominated by Communists. As the member of a top Washington influence firm, Fortas represented a host of men accused of Communist connections or associations, not without considerable success.

FORTAS SLOW TO TAKE PART IN WAR

Less well known is the Fortas military record. At the time of Pearl Harbor, Fortas was 31 years old. Although he had pumped for the war, he was slow to take part in it. On October 29, 1943, he was inducted into the Navy, but he remained in service only a few hours. As soon as he reported for duty as an apprentice seaman, he popped right out again with the aid of the late Secretary of Navy Frank Knox and other New Deal admirers. They got him out of the Navy to act as civilian head of an alphabetical government mission to study oil reserves in Arabia.

When he returned, he went back into the Navy, but he was released on December 13, 1943, after serving 1 month as an apprentice seaman, 29 days of the month in the hospital of Camp Sampson Naval Training Station in New York. He was then 33 years old, married, and with no children. His wife was and is a highly competent lawyer, able to earn her own way as she now does. He was discharged because it was said he had an arrested case of ocular tuberculosis. Twenty-two years later the case is still arrested and hasn't interfered with a lucrative law practice or a High Court appointment.

Fortas recently purchased a home in fashionable Georgetown at a price running into six figures. This would indicate he will be one of wealthiest men ever to serve on the High Court. His appointment is expected to breeze through a Senate dominated by his client, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The Independence Day of Dahomey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 2, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, the Republic of Dahomey celebrated the

fifth anniversary of its independence. The day was one of double national pride, for the people of Dahomey are not only commemorating 5 years of independence, but they are also dedicating the new port of Cotonou. On this occasion, I feel it appropriate to extend the congratulations and best wishes of the House to the Government, and people of the Republic of Dahomey.

The inauguration of the port is a fitting landmark to celebrate 5 years of national freedom. The opening of this deep-water facility signifies that Dahomey is making impressive progress in economic development. Now there is every reason to expect that Cotonou will become a growing center of transportation and commerce. Already a leader among west African nations for its level of education, Dahomey is now equipped to assume a position of growing importance in the field of transportation.

It is also fitting on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to recall the development projects which have grown out of the cooperation between our countries. The United States, itself once a recipient of foreign technical and capital assistance, knows the value and importance of a nation's own contribution to its growth. In this spirit, we have supported Dahomean programs in agricultural training, highway improvement, telecommunications, and public health. The distinguished Dahomean Ambassador, His Excellency Louis Ignacio-Pinto, has done much to establish and maintain these friendly, cooperative relations between Dahomey and the United States.

When Dahomey gained full independence 5 years ago, many of us had mixed feelings of concern and hope. The turbulent years of the 1960's are trying times for any nation, especially so for a young one. But the hope that the spirit of youth and freedom would provide the strength for survival and growth has been justified. That same spirit enables the people of Dahomey to look to the future with confidence.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES
IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey
Aiken, George D., *Vt.*-----
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*-----
Anderson, Clinton P., 6 Wesley Circle
N. Mex.
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*-----
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*-----
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind.*-----
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*---
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*-----
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del.*-----
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*-----1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N.,
N. Dak.
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*-----The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*-----
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*-----
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*-----Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J.*-----
Church, Frank, *Idaho*-----
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*-----
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*-----
Cotton, Norris, *N.H.*-----
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*-----
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*-----
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*-----
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo.*-----
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*-----
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*-----5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*-----
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C.*-----
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz.*-----
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*-----5519 Uppingham
St., Chevy Chase,
Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark.*-----
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*-----
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*-----
Harris, Fred R., *Okla.*-----
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*-----
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*-----
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*-----
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., 5511 Cedar Park-
Iowa-----way, Chevy Chase,
Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*-----
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*-----Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*-----
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*-----
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*-----
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y.*-----
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C.*-----
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*-----
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass.*-----
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y.*-----
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*-----
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*-----
Long, Edward V., *Mo.*-----
Long, Russell B., *La.*-----
McCarthy, Eugene J., 5916 Bradley
Minn.-----Bldg., Bethesda,
Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*-----
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*-----
McGovern, George, *S. Dak.*-----
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H.*-----
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*-----
Magnuson, Warren G., The Shoreham
Wash.-----
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*-----
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*-----453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*-----5417 Kirkwood
Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn.*-----
Monroney, A. S. Mike,
Okla.-----
Montoya, Joseph M.,
N. Mex.-----
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thurston B., *Ky.*-----
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*-----
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*-----122 Schotts
Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif.*-----
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*-----
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis.*-----
Neuberger, Maurine B.,
Oreg.-----
Pastore, John O., *R.I.*-----
Pearson, James B., *Kans.*-----
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I.*-----3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*-----

Proxmire, William, *Wis.*-----
Randolph, Jennings, W. Va. 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn.*-----
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*-----
Russell, Donald S., *S.C.*-----
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*-----
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.* 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*-----
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo.*-----
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*-----
Smith, Margaret Chase
(Mrs.), *Maine*-----
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*-----4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*-----
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*-----
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*-----
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C.*-----
Tower, John G., *Tex.*-----
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md.*-----
Williams, Harrison A., Jr.,
N.J.-----
Williams, John J., *Del.*-----
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*-----
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*-----Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*-----

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space
Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of
Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis,
Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland,
Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland,
Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris,

Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. *District of Columbia.*

First judicial circuit: Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.